

THE JOURNAL OF BIBLE AND RELIGION

PUBLISHED BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
BIBLICAL INSTRUCTORS TO FOSTER
RELIGION IN EDUCATION

Vol. XII

AUGUST, 1944

No. 3

THE WAR AND RELIGIOUS LEARNING	M. Willard Lampe	155
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JULIUS WELLHAUSEN.....	William A. Irwin	160
WELLHAUSEN ON THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS	Allen Wikgren	174
PAUL THROUGH JEWISH EYES	Amos N. Wilder	181
A RELIGIOUS ATTITUDE INVENTORY	Irwin R. Beiler	188
ELEVEN YEARS OF <i>The Journal of Bible and Religion</i>	Louise S. Eby	193
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR:		
A REJOINDER TO PROFESSOR CHAVE	George M. Gibson	190
BOOK REVIEWS:		
ANDERSON, WILLIAM K. (EDITOR), PROTESTANTISM		200
By Carl E. Purinton		
GRAY, JOSEPH M., THE POSTWAR STRATEGY OF RELIGION.....		201
By Ivan Gerould Grimshaw		
BOWER, WILLIAM, CHURCH AND STATE IN EDUCATION.....		201
By B. LeRoy Burkhardt		
NASH, ARNOLD S., THE UNIVERSITY AND THE MODERN WORLD.....		203
By Oliver Martin		
IRWIN, WILLIAM A., THE PROBLEM OF EZEKIEL		203
By James Müllenburg		
LATOURETTE, KENNETH SCOTT, THE GREAT CENTURY IN NORTHERN AFRICA AND ASIA, A. D. 1800-1914		205
By Charles S. Braden		
ISWOLSKY, HELEN, THE SOUL OF RUSSIA		206
By Charles S. Braden		
FAUSET, ARTHUR HUFF, BLACK GODS OF THE METROPOLIS.....		206
By Charles S. Braden		
GORDON, CYRUS H., THE LOVES AND WARS OF BAAL AND ANAT AND OTHER POEMS FROM UGARIT		207
By J. Philip Hyatt		
CAILLET, EMILE, THE CLUE TO PASCAL		208
By Wilfrid A. Rowell		

THE CONTRIBUTORS' COLUMN

Since 1927 DR. M. WILLARD LAMPE has been the Administrative Director of the School of Religion at the State University of Iowa. The distinctive feature of the School of Religion, which has been directed from the beginning by Dr. Lampe, is that it is an integral part of the University and also inter-faith in character. Its teachers, Jewish, Catholic, Protestant, while supported by private funds, have full and regular standing in the University faculty, and all the courses are accredited towards the University's degrees. The article on "The War and Religious Learning" is the main portion of a "Baconian Lecture" delivered under the auspices of the Graduate College for the benefit of the teaching staff and graduate students of all departments.

WILLIAM A. IRWIN is Professor of Old Testament at the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. Dr. Irwin's recent book, *The Problem of Ezekiel*, is reviewed in this issue. "The Significance of Julius Wellhausen" was originally presented as a paper before the combined meeting of the NABI and CSBR January 15, 1944 in recognition of the centenary year of Wellhausen's birth.

ALLEN WIKGREN is Assistant Professor of New Testament in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago where he has taught since 1941. His article, "Wellhausen on the Synoptic Gospels," is intended to supplement Dr. Irwin's paper, in order that Wellhausen's significance in New Testament study be not overlooked.

AMOS N. WILDER took his Ph.D. degree at Yale in the field of Christian Origins. He has taught at Hamilton College and at the Andover Newton Theological School and is now on the faculty of the Chicago Theological Seminary. The present paper on "Paul Through Jewish Eyes" was read at a joint meeting of the Chicago Society of Biblical Research and the Mid-west Branch of the N.A.B.I.

IRWIN R. BEILER is Professor of Religion at Allegheny College. He is author of *Studies in the Life of Jesus* and has given considerable attention to the development of religious attitude tests.

LOUISE S. EBY is Assistant Professor of Religion and Philosophy at Milwaukee-Downer College. She is author of *The Quest for Moral Law*, published by the Columbia University Press in June of this year.

Published in February, May, August and November by the National Association of Biblical Instructors. Publication Office, 36 East Main Street, Somerville, New Jersey. Editorial Office, Beloit College, Beloit, Wisconsin. The subscription price is \$3.00 per annum. Single copies, 75 cents. Entered as second-class matter February 14, 1939, at the post office at Somerville, New Jersey, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

The War and Religious Learning

M. WILLARD LAMPE

ARE THERE any advantages to religion, and particularly to the study of religion, growing out of the war? I think I see three.

Advantage number one, as I picture the post-war era, will consist of an extended freedom in the collection of important data for the historical study of religion. This prospect is posited of course upon the victory of the Allied Nations and the extension of the various freedoms throughout the world. It is not unreasonable to hope that every part of the world will be more open than ever for contact with, and study of, the various cultures. This will present an opportunity for expanding, corroborating or modifying the kind of material one finds in Frazer's *Golden Bough*, for there are islands of the sea, and patches of the continents, where a first-hand study of primitive beliefs and practices remains to be done. More important, (so far as most of us are concerned), there are scores of mounds in the Bible lands of the eastern Mediterranean world, mounds covering buried cities and a wealth of historic treasure, awaiting the pick and shovel of the excavator. Many difficulties in this field have been removed since the last war, and progress in the excavation of old sites, in Palestine especially, has been tremendous. Material has been uncovered that still awaits adequate interpretation by scholars. All of this will throw new light upon Bible history, including no doubt many an incident in the

lives of the heroes of the Old and New Testaments. Moreover there is no reason to believe that the day of the recovery of Bible manuscripts is past. The most important may yet be found. It is probably too much to expect that the original of any Bible book still exists. But when one recalls what has been found in recent years,—the Chester Beatty papyri, for example, portions of which contain sections of the New Testament in Greek written about 200 A. D., more than a hundred years earlier than the great codices of the 4th century which were once thought to be the earliest Greek manuscripts we would ever find,—one dare not put a limit to possibilities. There is now only a gap of about 100 years between the original manuscripts and the earliest extant Greek copies of some portions of the New Testament, far less than in the case of any other great classical writing (there is a gap of 350 years in the case of Vergil and 1300 years for most of Plato). This whole situation should provide inducement to push the search in what we hope will be the freer conditions of the days ahead. In short, much remains to be done in filling out the picture of the development of the Hebrew religion, of the early days of Christianity and the story of the Christian Church, indeed the historic detail of all the religions. Scholarship may be expected therefore to thrive and take on new life in this field.

Advantage number two, for which it is not necessary to wait until the post-war era,

is of an entirely different kind. It is the wide-spread sense of tragedy in human life. I call it an "advantage" simply because of the stimulus it provides for the religious quest. Of course no war, great or small, is needed to provide this stimulus in some degree. Peace has its tragedies as well as war, and no life or community is ever free therefrom for long. But just as "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church," so tragedy in any massed or unrelieved form adds urgency to the religious enterprise; for the religious enterprise, whatever else it may be, is the pursuit of—some would say the pursuit by—some reality that explains tragedy.

Take, for example, the factor of moral evil, wherein much of life's tragedy lies. To this the times are compelling serious thinkers to give new and critical attention. Examples are Professor P. A. Sorokin, chairman of the Department of Sociology of Harvard University, Professor C. E. M. Joad, teacher of Philosophy and Psychology in the University of London, and Professor Reinhold Niebuhr of Union Theological Seminary, New York City. I mention these because all of them have recently written highly praised books in which the evil in human nature is probed in the light of the contemporary situation. There have been times when thinkers have seriously studied the evil in human nature, even at the expense of ignoring the good. But this has not been true of recent decades. Sins in our times have become complexes, phobias, or just mistakes. The attitude towards moral offences has been light-minded and light-hearted. We have witnessed a parade of evil on millions of printed pages, without indignation or condemnation on the part of the writers, and probably not very much on the part of the readers. Of course it has been necessary to give answers and explanations to the problem of moral evil, for after all it stands too much in the way of our happiness to be just laughed at or forgotten, but—and this is the main line of our thought—some of these answers and ex-

planations which seemed plausible enough under conditions of expanding markets, peace and relative security, do not stand up so well today. To mention two of them which have had wide vogue: first, the view that moral evil is due primarily to economic injustice and inequality and may be eliminated by the abolition of poverty; and second, the view that evil is due to psychological inhibitions, and may be cured either by resort to the psycho-analyst, or much better by seeing to it that parents, nurses and school-teachers do not prevent the free expression of the natively good life of the child. Now far be it from anyone to belittle economic justice or the releasing of any dammed-up goodness in the conscious or sub-conscious life of children or adults. But these explanations, under the goad of the world's tragedy, simply do not seem adequate to an increasing number of thinkers.

Some time ago a pamphlet was written under some such title as this: "The Difficulties of a Man of Culture in Accepting a Gospel of Redemption." It is not hard to understand such difficulties when one is seated in his library in a comfortable chair after dinner, but they tend to disappear in fox holes and on rafts at sea. I have heard intelligent professors and bright students say that the phrase "being saved," used religiously, is absolutely meaningless to them. Yet it seems to have profound meaning to good minds at grips with moral realities. The first cry of all high religion is "Repent," "Change your mind," but of course the cry is meaningless unless there is some awareness of what to repent of, or to change one's mind about. It is at this point that the contemporary and post-war world situation may help in building the altars of religion. Many people are saying that what the country and the world need is a "spiritual revival." The idea may be vague, but the motivation is good, and it is a challenge to religious leadership, including religious learning, to give form and substance to

these aspirations. In walking down the street the other day with an esteemed colleague whom I had never heard use religious language except playfully or by way of rhetorical emphasis, he remarked in all seriousness, "when I read the newspapers today, I wonder over and over again what God was up to in making a world like this." When reading the newspapers makes a university professor think of God, the hour has struck calling religious scholarship, if it has been napping, to wake up! Thus it may be said that tragedy presents three gifts to religion: more standing-room, a more obvious point of departure, and a clearer orientation towards ideal goals.

Now there is a danger in all of this which I do not care to conceal or minimize. I think I can name and describe it in a single sentence. The purely emotional forms of religion, "the lunatic fringe" as it is sometimes called, also thrives on tragedy, and doubtless in the post-war world will thrive vigorously by taking advantage of the wide extent of human misery. My only comment on this is that the task of religious learning is thereby made only the more urgent. Never is it more important to "love God with all the mind" than when one proposes to "love him with all the heart." True, religious learning involves more than the use of the reason, for religion in spirit is an art as well as a science or a philosophy. But whatever other appropriate insights religious learning may and should use, it must exalt the function of the reason. It should ceaselessly remember, as Principal L. P. Jacks once said of the Rationalist Society of London, "God is pleased when the publications of the Rationalist press are really rational, and angry when they are not."

We can expect of course that in the philosophy of religion the various schools of thought will continue to exist—the supernaturalists and naturalists, the idealists and romanticists, with many overlappings and varying accents on authority and freedom—in other words about the same number of

groups and tensions as are found in any department of live learning. All of them should profit by the advantage which tragedy brings, and also by the corresponding decline in plausibility of all moods and views that belittle religion or the need of religion, such as the mood of opulent optimism, the siren call of the beautiful theory of automatic progress, and most of all the popular fallacy that naturalistic science is the only pathway to the understanding of reality. Thus I think that religious learning in the post-war world will be quickened in range and depth, for it will be stimulated to make sense out of, to put sense into, man's deepest experiences. I predict that all the schools and philosophies of religion will be prompted to re-study and re-state the best possible grounds for the characteristic intuitions and beliefs of religion, viz., that in spite of tragedy life has meaning, that the Power which endowed us with a sense of justice and a capacity to love—we shall see in the end—does not mock us, and that in the meantime there is at the heart of reality the possibility of redemption from moral evil. My expectation of course is predicated on the assumption that while the particular tragedies of the current war—the spectacular massiveness of its cruelty, perfidy and rapacity,—will not be continued on the same level in the post-war period, yet they will be vividly remembered for a time, and moreover the post-war period will have its own characteristic tragedies of frustration, disillusionment and moral backwash, as all wars do. Days of widespread complacency and security are a long way off.

Advantage number three is a happier one to contemplate. It is the advantage created by the widespread, fervid interest in the idea and the ideal of *One World*. This, to speak colloquially, is right up religion's alley, for in spite of all its divisiveness, religion cherishes the ideal of unity. The concept, *One World* has already been well learned, theoretically, by the monotheistic religions. Great is the contemporary oppor-

tunity and proud that they should continue to "learn by doing" something about it. How may this be done? The answer, I think, is to be found in the already existing movements towards unity,—movements within two grand areas.

First, movements towards wider understanding and unity within the ranks of religion itself. In this paper I can only list some of the more important of them and indicate their relationship to high-grade research. Here is the so-called Ecumenical Movement within Protestantism, the Eastern Orthodox Churches participating. This movement has enlisted scores of study commissions, published a library of books, held several world conferences, and has already issued in a World Council of Churches, joined to date by 78 ecclesiastical bodies, and awaiting only the close of the war to be formally organized and launched. Then here is the inter-faith movement among all branches of the Jewish-Christian tradition, with its seminars, community round-tables, national institutes and mounting volume of published studies,—a movement symbolized on a wide scale by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and locally by the inter-faith School of Religion on this campus. Still another illustration is found in the techniques and procedures of the Christian Missionary Movement which brings Christianity into relationship with other living religions. The new mood is well symbolized by E. Stanley Jones, one of the outstanding Protestant missionaries of our times. His book *Christ at the Round-table*, for example, shows that in dealing with the religious leaders of India, his practice was to assemble an inter-faith group around a table, to share views, and then to debate in friendly fashion their respective positions. When he was on this campus for a week he did the same thing, and many will remember the sincerity with which he would ask the question, "if you have a faith better than the one I hold, I honestly want to know what it is." I do not imply that this

is the method of all missionaries, but it is a method for which many religious groups and leaders are ready, and it offers great learning possibilities.

The second grand area of enlarging unities is found in the fellowships that are coming into existence between professional religious groups and other specialized agencies of research and human service. Here again I can give in this paper only an illustrative list and with the minimum of description. Religion is joining hands with Medicine and Psychiatry in service to the sick. Witness the parade of books in the field of Religion and Health, all showing collaboration between religious specialists and mental or medical scientists. Harry Emerson Fosdick's best seller *On Being a Real Person* is one of the least technical. The existence of a Council for the Clinical Training of Theological Students is another indication of what is going on.

Religion and Social Science are joining hands. Witness the joint national gatherings of Church and Community Social Service Agencies, the Religion and Labor Foundation, interfaith in character, and the prestige that a religious leader like Fr. John A. Ryan has in all areas where social questions are discussed.

Again, Religion, Philosophy and Science are joining hands, at least to the extent of trying to do something cooperatively for the preservation of the democratic way of life. Four annual sessions have already been held of the so-called Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion, made up of outstanding scholars in all of these fields. These sessions, according to all reports, were not without strong emotional outbursts, but the emotion seems to have been about equally divided among the three groups, so balance was kept and progress made.

Finally, and perhaps most important of all, Religion and Education are joining hands. To be sure in some areas these natural partners have never "let go" hands, but in other areas they have done so, notably

in public education. If however one should read either the religious or the educational journals of the day, or should follow legislation in the field, e.g. that affecting released time for religious education, or the proposed Education Bill of the British Government, he would be impressed by the concern that is manifest for bringing religion and education into closer partnership. Both the philosophy of this relationship and the practical problems that are coming up might well claim the time, even the life-time, of the brightest students. Take the matter of curriculum, for example. Public education shows many signs of making room for a greater amount of moral and religious training. But what should be the substance of this training on the various levels? Can such training be made educationally sound, religiously vital and in accord with American political principles? Many educational administrators are yearning for an intelligent and defensible answer to such questions. To illustrate the difficulty and provide a point for bringing this paper to a close, let me tell a story.

In walking to class one day a colleague in another department asked, "What in the world can one teach in a class in Religion?"

I replied, "Religion has had a long history. One might teach that."

"But that would be history, not religion," he countered.

"One might teach the Bible," I ventured.

"That would be literature, not religion," he responded.

"Well, one might teach religion as a way of living, a philosophy of life," I insisted.

"But that would be the same as ethics and philosophy, wouldn't it?"

I tried once more. "Perhaps one might draw all these strands together,—history, Bible, experience and standards and try to relate them to the individual student as he faces the whole of life."

"I should say," my friend said as we parted, "that is a pretty ambitious program, but I wish you luck."

As I reflected upon it afterwards, there seemed to be truth on both sides of our conversation. Religion is so much a part of life that one can hardly avoid teaching something about it in every classroom. I have often mused with amusement on this fact: because of our American principles the School of Religion in this university, which presumably is qualified to teach religion with academic proficiency, is supported (so far as the Protestant, Catholic and Jewish departments are concerned) entirely by private funds; but many other departments of the university can and do and, I think, should teach important phases of religion at state expense. I say "should" for how could a teacher of history or literature or philosophy or sociology handle his proper subject-matter and altogether avoid questions on religion? One might have cause for complaint at any lack of sympathetic understanding on controversial issues, but certainly not for any scholarly reference to the matter itself. Teaching should be untrammelled by squeamishness no less than bias.

But the other side of the conversation I had with my colleague is also true. Religion has its distinctive sphere which is synthetic in nature. It stands for unity, solidarity, integration, the integration of the individual, the solidarity of society, the unity of *One World*, and since by its very nature it stands for these ideals, how imperious are the demands, and unprecedented the opportunity, which are created by the current aspirations of men for the greatest measure of world unity and order. It will be just too bad if this advantage is not used to the full.

The Significance of Julius Wellhausen

WILLIAM A. IRWIN

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY may well be regarded as one of the great epochs of human attainment. A century that witnessed the application of steam power to transportation both by sea and by land with a steadily growing maze of lines of steel traversing continents and the newer shipping interlacing its ways across the trackless oceans; that saw, too, the invention and wide use of telegraph and telephone, the beginnings of the daily newspaper and of cheap postage, and toward its end gave ever increasing application of the uses of electricity to the lighting and lightening of human life, must surely be adjudged a time of transformation such that today we are separated by a great gulf from the ways of life of the Napoleonic period, even yet but little more than a century and a quarter behind us. It was supremely a scientific age.

The application of devices and inventions to the needs of human life was, however, less significant than the expansive mood that took possession of men's minds in the presence of ever enlarging vistas of truth which science continued with accelerating speed to spread open. It was a time that might well seem the fulfillment of that great awakening of the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries when on the background of the renaissance movement there came the invention of printing, which, mere physical achievement as it was, has proved one of the most far-reaching events in the history of human thought, then the age of voyages that shook men out of their smug provincialism with the vision of a world immensely greater and more mysterious than ever before dreamed; and, finally and greatest of all, the Protestant Reformation, one of the supreme episodes in the long struggle for the freedom

of the human soul. Such, too, was the nineteenth century. It saw the official termination of slavery throughout the civilized world; it witnessed a steady growth of social consciousness and social responsibility; it contributed both the organization of labor and the rise of the co-operative movement; it saw notable attainments in the use of democracy, the realization of manhood suffrage (it fell just short of extending this to women as well), and the spread of democratic institutions through much of the civilized world. Appropriately Tennyson voiced the mood of the time:

Yet I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs
And the thoughts of men are broader with the
process of the suns.

For with all the achievements in politics, society, or in ways of life, the profound reality of the century was its sense of enlargement. Ever new worlds of truth opened before the amazed consciousness of the age. Even to list systems of thought and their chief representatives or to survey the notable advances of science would lead us afar from our present purpose. We rest content with two aspects of this that blend together into a remarkable upheaval of thought. The researches of the Scotch geologist, Sir Charles Lyell, crystallized in his *Principles of Geology* (1830-33) opened up an immense and undreamed of antiquity of the history of the world. But discoveries were taking place also in regard to the antiquity of man. It is difficult for us at this date to realize how recent is this entire outlook. But remains of the so-called Gibraltar man, one of the first finds to attract special attention to this phase of human history, came to light only in 1848. It was eight

years later that the first specimen of the now well-known Neanderthal man was discovered. And the Cro-Magnon, Trinil, Heidelberg, Piltdown and Pekin finds were scattered across subsequent decades right into our own times. Already in 1863 Lyell astonished the time with his results upon the available materials in his *Antiquity of Man*. But in the meantime, in 1859, a still more revolutionary work had been published—that was Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species*. "With Lyell's extension of the conception of time in geology and Darwin's extension of the conception of evolution, the old order in thought seemed to have been swept away. Sir William Huggins, in his presidential address to the Royal Society in 1905, graphically describes the revolution as it appeared to a contemporary from the standpoint of science:

The accumulated tension of scientific progress burst upon the mind, not only of the nation, but of the whole intelligent world, with a suddenness and an overwhelming force for which the strongest material metaphors are poor and inadequate. Twice the bolt fell, and twice, in a way to which history furnishes no parallel, the opinions of mankind may be said to have changed in a day. Changed not on some minor points standing alone, but each time on a fundamental position which, like a keystone, brought down with it an arch of connected beliefs and resting on long cherished ideas and prejudices. What took place was not merely the acceptance by mankind of new opinions, but complete inversions of former beliefs, involving the rejection of views which had grown sacred by long inheritance."¹

We may do no more here than mention the beginning of the scientific study of religion that, impelled by Darwin's findings, seized thoughtful minds under the leadership of Lubbock, Spencer and Tyler, and by the early seventies had established itself as a serious scholarly discipline. But, too, we must not fail to call attention to the amazing revelations of the infant science of archaeology which with the decipherments of Champollion and Rawlinson, and the finds of Layard, George Smith and Rassam

in the Orient, and of Schliemann in Greece and Ionia were literally thrilling the contemporary world with a resurrection of long dead and forgotten civilizations.

It was, then, in the vibrant atmosphere of such a time that modern criticism of the Bible found its determining form. Profoundly significant as it has proven in the history of religious thinking, it was, itself, none the less, deeply indebted to the mood and findings of the nineteenth century. It was, one might say, a worthy child of that great age, which grew up to take itself an honored place among its famous contemporaries, and to make its distinctive contribution in the ever-new struggle for human freedom.

The work of Witter and Astruc, of Eichhorn and De Wette, of Georg and Vatke and Ewald is well known. The meticulous study, the intense discussion, the serious criticism and re-criticism given to the subject by these and a host of less-known scholars through many decades must be realized by those who would understand their findings. However, by the middle of the century, Pentateuchal criticism, which in a way was to prove the standard-bearer for the entirety of Biblical criticism, had reached a position that cannot be better summarized than in the words of Abraham Kuenen of Leyden, himself a recognized leader in the movement:

"The main points upon which unanimity seemed gradually to have been reached were the following: 'The Deuteronomist, a contemporary of Manasseh or Josiah, was the redactor of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua, and it was he who brought them into the form in which they now lie before us. He interwove or inserted his own laws and narratives into the work of the Yahwist that dated from the eighth century B. C., and was therefore about a hundred years prior to his time. To this Yahwist we owe the first four books of the Pentateuch and the earlier (prae-deuteronomic) recension of Joshua. His work was in its turn based upon a still earlier composition—the "Grundschrift" or "Book of Origins" which came from the pen of a priest or Levite and might be referred to the century of Solomon. Em-

bedded in this "Grundschrift" were still more ancient fragments, some of them Mosaic. The Yahwist expanded and supplemented the Grundschrift and materials drawn in part from tradition and in part from written sources."²

The instability of the position is at this date obvious to every student of the Pentateuch. Put in now familiar terms, it held that the priestly document is the oldest and original source of the Pentateuch; it was used, however, by the Yahwist, but only as a source book, for he is the real author of the work as we know it, save for the editorial changes and insertions of the Deuteronomist. Kuenen admits having entertained some misgivings as to the position, but, none the less, he accepted the current consensus of opinion. The way out was to be shown not by one of the leading scholars of Europe, but by a churchman, isolated on the mission field.

Bishop J. W. Colenso tells how he was engaged in his see in the colony of Natal translating the Bible into Zulu when, in the midst of his work on the Flood story, one of his native helpers looked up and said, "Is all this true? Do you really believe that all this happened thus—that all the beasts and birds and creeping things upon the earth, large and small, from hot countries and cold, came thus by pairs and entered into the ark with Noah?" "My heart answered," he says, "in the words of the prophet, 'Shall a man speak lies in the Name of the Lord?' I dared not do so—I gave him, however, such a reply as satisfied him for the time being, without throwing any discredit upon the general veracity of the Bible story."³ And so the bishop was compelled to undertake a detailed study of the historicity of the Pentateuch with results that exceeded anything he had anticipated. An immediate outcome of his publication of results was a storm of protest and denunciation that reached its climax in his condemnation and later excommunication by the Bishop of Capetown. But Colenso had written in the conviction that it

was a "duty to the Church itself . . . to claim for all its members, clerical as well as lay, that freedom of thought and utterance which is the very essence of our Protestant religion" (id. p. 10). And great events toward this end were taking place. On February 8, 1864 the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council delivered a decision in a comparable case that is regarded as the charter of free Biblical inquiry within the Established Church of England, so it is not at all remarkable that when Colenso's appeal was heard a few months later, he was legally vindicated and restored to his see.

But not less in critical matters, Colenso's results were unexpected. What he had done was to subject the Pentateuchal narratives to meticulous examination for consistency and credibility; he found at a host of points that the plain statements of Scripture were beyond belief, if not, indeed, actually absurd. But he failed to recognize the significance of his findings. For he continued to accept the contemporary critical theory of the structure of the Pentateuch. It was Kuenen who realized that it was the revered "Grundschrift" on which Colenso's strictures fell most heavily. "He showed that the very documents which most expressly put themselves forward as authentic . . . are in reality the most unhistorical. In other words, it is just the narratives of the "Grundschrift" which turn out to be most helpless before criticism." (op. cit. p. xvi.)

This same period saw two other notable contributions to the investigation, which are of prime importance to us as providing the immediate background of the work of Julius Wellhausen. This same year, 1862, gave to scholarship the treatise of J. Popper, *Der biblische Berichte über die Stiftshütte. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Composition and Diaskeuse des Pentateuchs*. "The results of Popper's investigation are in substance as follows: 'The description of the rearing of the tabernacle (Exod. 35-40) and of the consecration of the priests to their task

(Lev. 8) is later than the injunctions on these two subjects (Exod. 25-31), and cannot have received its present form until long after the Babylonian captivity.'"⁴ The significance of this study as shaking the contemporary belief in the unity of the so-called Grundschrift is apparent. Three years later a much more famous work was to appear. At the end of 1865 K. H. Graf of Strassburg published his *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments. Zwei historisch-kritische Untersuchungen*. The first of these two essays dealt with the Chronicler and showed effectively the freedom with which this writer manipulated his sources and expanded them in accord with his dogmatic conviction—an important result as depriving the revered Grundschrift of alleged support. But the second essay on *Die Bestandtheile der Geschlichen Bucher* von Gen. 1 bis. 2 Kings 25 examined specifically the situations and sequences of the various strata of the historical books. Taking his departure from the accepted critical dating of Deuteronomy he showed that by the evidence of Deuteronomy and of the historical practices, the laws of the Yahwist were earlier than Deuteronomy and those of the Grundschrift were later. But not this alone: he demonstrated that some of the narratives also of this famous document were late, in some cases subsequent to Ezra. However, he left the Grundschrift essentially where the criticism of the time put it. And the strange result that it should then contain both the very earliest and the latest material he explained on the ground that some late priestly circles had so saturated themselves in the style and thought of the document that they were able to give to their own work the mood and atmosphere of an age-old writing.

Kuenen says that the unsoundness of this position at once drew his attention to the obvious fact that the supposed pre-Yahwistic origin of the "elohistic" narratives had no basis whatever. "Not only does the prophetic preaching precede the priestly

legislation, but the prophetic (i. e., Yahwistic) representations of the genesis of the theocracy precede the priestly historiography. And may we not ask, in passing," he goes on, "whether the problem when so formulated does not almost solve itself?"⁵

He wrote Graf in this mood, and received a reply from him dated November 12, 1866, in which the latter admitted freely the unsatisfactoriness of the solution he had advanced, agreed that the alleged priority of the priestly narratives had been generally accepted only as a sort of axiom the reversal of which would produce a veritable revolution in criticism, but stated also that he would in the future not fail to examine the situation with this astonishing point of view in mind.

Yet matters were to stand in essentially this position for a decade—a decade, however, tense with discussion and an expectancy of great things to come. Its most notable contributions were Kuenen's *Religion of Israel* in 1869-70, and in 1875 Duhm's *Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte der Israelitischen Religion*. But in 1876 in the *Jahrbücher der Deutsche Theologie*, Julius Wellhausen began his series of articles on "Die Composition des Hexateuchs."⁶ The young professor ordinarius of theology at Greifswald was already known for solid, scholarly work. Born May 17, 1844, at Hameln on the Weiser in Westphalia, he had experienced the stimulus of study under Heinrich Ewald at Göttingen. There he took his degree in 1870, submitting as his dissertation *De gentibus et familiis Judeis quae I Chron 2.4 enumerantur*. In the same year he established himself at his alma mater as privatdozent in Old Testament history, but went two years later as professor ordinarius of theology to the chair in Greifswald that was to become famous through his epochal work. In 1871 he published a penetrating study of the text of the books of Samuel, in 1874 *Die Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, and in 1875 a contribution to the

Jahrbücher der Deutsche Theologie, Die Zeitrechnung des Buchs der Könige. Thus, his findings in the analysis of the Hexateuch could not be lightly dismissed as the theories of a neophyte.

None the less, his epochal contribution to the problem was not his *Composition*, but the study published in 1878 as *Geschichte Israels, in zwei Bänden, Erster Band*, and republished five years later under a title now famous throughout the world of Biblical scholarship, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*.⁷ This work may well be regarded, notwithstanding all that had gone before, as the foundation of recent Pentateuchal study, and in a sense the charter of Biblical criticism in general. Its success was immediate and phenomenal. Kuenen writes, "I can hardly describe the delight with which I first read it . . . a delight such as seldom meets one on the path of learning . . . Wellhausen's treatment of our theme . . . was so cogent, so original, and so brilliant that its publication may be regarded as the 'crowning fight' in the long campaign."⁸ And Robertson Smith in 1885, after a brief statement of how the "Grafian hypothesis" had earlier been neglected, goes on, "Since 1878 . . . mainly through the impression produced by Wellhausen's book, all this has been changed. Almost every younger scholar of mark is on the side of Vatke and Reuss, Lagarde and Graf, Kuenen and Wellhausen, and the renewed interest in Old Testament study which is making itself felt throughout all the schools of Europe must be traced almost entirely to the stimulus derived from a new vision of the history of the Law which sets all Old Testament problems in a new light."⁹

But precisely what was Wellhausen's contribution? It will be seen from our hasty sketch of the criticism of the time that he is not responsible for the famous JEDP analysis of the Hexateuch. Even his *Composition des Hexateuchs* would be unintelligible on that assumption, for in it he fully accepts the work of his predecessors, does

no more than adopt somewhat different symbols for the documents [Q (= quatuor) JE, D and R] and advocate many new conclusions in details of analysis. And the *Prolegomena*, after a brief survey of the problem, "Is the Law the starting-point for the history of ancient Israel or for that of Judaism?", takes up its theme under the successive heads, "History of Worship," "History of Tradition," and "Israel and Judaism." Throughout, it confronts the sections that we now call the Priestly document with the evidence of the prophets and historical books, always with the same result that these latter are prior in time. In other words, his contribution here likewise is not that of discovery, for we have seen that Kuenen came clearly to recognize this situation, and Graf admitted it. Briefly, then, the views with which Wellhausen's name are associated are not primarily his at all; they are but the logical and apparently inescapable result of a century of careful investigation by hosts of scholars with the balancing of theory against theory until possible solutions were narrowed down by elimination.¹⁰

But then did Wellhausen make no contribution? Does his fame *in toto* rest vicariously on the achievements of others? Such a view would be an exaggeration. The immediate and perhaps paramount impression made by a reading of his famous books at this distance is one of familiarity. Allowing for some little strangeness in symbols and some excess of statement, one feels that the type of thought, to say nothing of the conclusions, is the commonplace of Biblical criticism of our day. It is throughout an appeal to objective evidence: an analysis of literary and historic sources and the employment of these in that logically objective way which we associate with the historic method. And Wellhausen's supremacy is in his consistent application of this method. The words of Kuenen just now quoted contain the gist of the matter: "Wellhausen's treatment of our theme was so

cogent, . . . so brilliant . . ." We must not belittle his achievement; he it was who possessed the insight to recognize the logical meaning of the direction that critical thought and achievements of the time had taken, and the ability to present this conclusion with inescapable logic. And the same qualities of clear thinking and objectivity in the use of evidence carried him on through his entire career of criticism of, first, the Old Testament, then, the New. Yet equally it is important to realize fully that his greatness and significance are as the voice of an age, as the climax of a long and widely diffused activity. In a sense he is the symbol of nineteenth century Biblical criticism.

The presuppositions of Wellhausen's work have frequently been called in question. He records, himself, that his two principal assumptions were "that the work of the Jehovist, so far as the nucleus of it is concerned, belongs to the course of the Assyrian period, and that Deuteronomy belongs to its close."¹¹ But obviously this does not penetrate deep enough. It is commonly charged that his results are dictated and determined by a rigid evolutionary theory. Such is one of the three basic charges of Jean Coppens¹² against the Wellhausen hypothesis. But the attack is made even more pointed. W. F. Albright is emphatic in his claim that "Wellhausen and his school, to which belonged in the last decade before the World War practically every Protestant Old Testament scholar of standing in the world, reflect their Hegelian background in various ways." These ways he lists, but immediately weakens his charge with the reservation that "in stressing the origin of these ideas we do not, of course, mean to refuse them any validity." His prime evidence is that "Wellhausen freely acknowledged his debt to W. Vatke (1806-62) from whom he had 'learned the most and best.'" And "Vatke was an ardent Hegelian."¹³

Now it cannot be denied that Wellhausen made this admission. Indeed he said more.

He claimed that his "inquiry proceeds on a broader basis than that of Graf, and comes nearer to that of Vatke," and that "it is only in the region of religious antiquities and dominant religious ideas—the region which Vatke in his *Biblische Theologie* had occupied in its full breadth, and where the real battle first kindled—that the controversy can be brought to a definite issue."¹⁴ But while it is one thing to admit debt to a Hegelian, it is quite a different matter to confess acceptance of his Hegelian theories. Vatke's outstanding contribution to Penta-teuchal criticism was his demonstration that the prophets are a primary, and major, source of evidence for religious conditions and practices against which to test the antiquity of the priestly legal system.¹⁵ And when we see that this is precisely the core of Wellhausen's argument in the *Prolegomena*, it becomes apparent what it was that he had learned "most and best." One searches in vain through his writings for a definite case of Hegelian philosophy or evolutionary theory determining critical results. On the contrary, as already pointed out, his method is one of testing results by objective evidence and of building conclusions on established fact. The "Wellhausen school" whom Albright so lightly summarizes would doubtless deny en masse all connivance with Hegelian theories in their investigation. The spirit of the whole critical movement—and Albright may not so easily assume the complaint of Elijah on Horeb for he himself is clearly of "the Wellhausen school" notwithstanding his Mosaic heresy—is that an evolutionary concept of Israel's religion and history, if entertained at all, must be the result, not the presupposition of an investigation of relevant evidence.

A much more vulnerable point of attack on the theory has been its neat finality, its apparent solution of all relevant problems, that manifested itself in two directions. Wellhausen himself set an example for those who would make the Hexateuchal

documents creations, and, in considerable measure pious frauds of the age assigned to them. It is true that so prominent a "critic" of this early period of the theory as S. R. Driver, with his characteristic caution admits, no rather emphasizes, that the Priestly document contains considerable very old material and that its late date applies only to its final amplification and editing.¹⁶ But not so Wellhausen and exponents of his theory in its extreme form. For them J and E were valid evidence of the thinking of the ninth and eighth centuries, but of no significance for the times they purported to recount. Deuteronomy was a document of the close of "the Assyrian period;" and P was as much a creation of the imagination as the Books of Chronicles were believed to be. Such views we may no longer entertain. In some measure through more cautious literary criticism, but in much greater degree because of the contributions of archaeology, we now see clearly that the problem is much more complex than was supposed sixty years ago. All the documents possess some, as yet but vaguely apprehended, element of historic dependability. The study of places and names in Palestine and the surrounding region, the tracing of ancient routes, the surviving evidence of civilizations long overwhelmed, our increased knowledge of ethnic movements in the second millennium B. C., and discoveries such as Hurrian family law, fitting in as they do with this or that feature of the Hexateuchal record, all demonstrate alike that in these sources we deal not with creations of fertile imaginations, but with records, which, however re-used, expanded and altered through the process of time, rest ultimately on a nucleus of ancient and valid accounts of patriarchal times.

The other side of the Wellhausen certitude has been the finality of its literary analysis. Through the closing years of the last century and at least the first decade of the present one, Pentateuchal analysis went on a spree! Its multiplication of sources,

still more the finesse with which it divided and subdivided paragraphs and even single sentences into two, three or four original elements, was such as to call the whole activity into disrepute. Quite properly D'Arcy¹⁷ has charged it with a lack of "robust good sense." But what he and his like fail to recognize is that condemnation of excess is not equivalent to refutation of sane and moderate methods. It is well for us once again to invoke S. R. Driver who pointed out that separation of sources is, especially as regards J and E, "frequently uncertain;" hence for much of this source he contented himself with designating it JE.

The theory comes in for criticism, also, on the ground that it is false to the method of ancient composition, which always consists of supplementation, i. e., the embodiment into a main document of chosen excerpts from relevant writings. This would mean that Pentateuchal criticism of the nineteenth century prior to Hupfeldt was on the right line, and that with Graf, Kuenen and Wellhausen it took the wrong turn. Such is the view of Professor Olmstead¹⁸; such, too, would seem to approximate the position of D. B. McDonald, who, while admitting fully the critical analysis of Genesis, yet treats it as the united product of a single mind of great power and philosophic depth.¹⁹ But actually the documentary and this form of the supplementary theories do not diverge far. Classic Wellhausenism would, it is true, understand the Hexateuch as the result of a sort of scissors and paste procedure. Yet the theory freely recognizes that J and E were put together by some Judean after the fall of Samaria, hence employing his own document as the original source into which excerpts of E were incorporated. Since both schools of critics, the documentary and the supplementary, consider that the union of JE with Deuteronomy was the work of some member of this latter school of thought, there would seem to be little disagreement; we can regard the procedure as a supplementation of

D with the JE narratives, or we may take the view that the Deuteronomist merely appended his document to the other. But in regard to the final activity, that of the priestly editors, there is apparently no disagreement between the two schools of critics unless perhaps in terms and modes of expression, for everyone recognizes that the framework of the Hexateuch is that of P and the incorporation of the JE and D material must have been a sort of supplementation.

Along the line indicated by these considerations the major development of the mood and attitude of criticism of the past sixty years has moved. There has grown up a caution and moderation that can scarcely be regarded as characteristic of most early exponents of the theory. We are much less certain in large areas of the analysis. The "Polychrome Bible" would be an impossibility today, unless indeed its pages were to be plentifully adorned with one more color, a neutral shade indicative of a generous confession of ignorance. And, too, we no longer dismiss Hexateuchal statements and stories as unworthy of attention.

Yet, contradictory as it then seems, analysis has been pushed beyond the limits of Wellhausen's theory, to find documents that he ignored. As early as 1883 both Schrader²⁰ and Budde²¹ declared for the subdivision of J and E each into three sources. This was supported and clarified by Smend in 1912, to whose work²² we owe the popularity of the symbols of J¹ and J². These, he claimed, were distinct authors whose work runs parallel through much of the Hexateuch; but, on the other hand, the alleged E² and E³ in actuality belonged to the J total, so that the analysis reduced to J¹, J², and E. At length in 1922 Eissfeldt in his *Hexateuch-Synopse* designated J¹ as L, retaining then the symbol J for the so-called J². Less well-known is Morgenstern's identification of a "K" document.²³ And with that the matter rests, save that Pfeiffer

through his *Introduction* has popularized the symbol S. But since the source he so indicates is, through Genesis, practically identical with Eissfeldt's L, his repudiation of the latter sounds very like the dispute over tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee. One further aspect of this activity of literary analysis demands mention. In 1937 Mowinkel²⁴ presented cogent arguments for the position that the E source, hitherto believed to begin in Gen. 12, in reality is to be recognized in the 'amadah strand in the Creation story of Gen. 2, in the Sethite genealogy, and in parts of the Flood story: hence, the startling result that the extant fragments of E begin with Creation, just as J.

However, an engrossing question is, How has the theory fared through two generations of recriticism by those who would repudiate and overthrow it? The attack has come from four main directions which we may designate as fundamentalist, Roman Catholic, conservative Jewish and, for lack of a better distinction, critical. There has been, though, much overlapping of the first three, so that it is not profitable to hold our survey to these classifications.

Throughout its entire history the critical theory has met two sorts of opposition, the logical and the authoritarian. Opponents have claimed—indeed they have gleefully demonstrated (to their own satisfaction) that the procedure of the critics is stupid, ignorant and illogical. The reply of W. H. Green to Bishop Colenso's first volume is a fine piece of literary abuse, its pages scintillating with barbed insinuations and gentlemanly sneers.²⁵ Many will doubtless recall also the studies of the late Harold M. Wiener²⁶ as about the most irritating polemic met with in many a page of disputation. The whole critical theory, he alleged, rests upon an inability to distinguish a house from a cairn! But likewise the "anti-critics" have steadily appealed to the authority of the Bible and, specifically, of Christ. Green draws his argument to a conclusion

with the consideration, "We cannot give up our faith in the Bible. To do so is to surrender ourselves to blank despair." Still more emphatic were the words of Rev. John Cumming,²⁷ "The Bishop's logic sweeps away everything that we trust in . . . If Moses was not . . . the writer of the Pentateuch what mean the words of Paul in Acts xxvi, 22? . . . What a pity Paul was not as enlightened as Colenso!" To the present day this is the repertoire of opponents of the critical theory. The work of Oswald T. Allis, published in 1943, undertakes to show the absurdities of the critical position—in some of which he is right, since his argument rests on the extremes to which analysis was carried—but claims that "the final question" is "What think ye of Christ?"²⁸ It is to Allis' credit that while giving consideration to the argument from variations of the divine titles, he recognizes that this phenomenon is subsidiary to distinctions of style and thought. Not so, however, many others who have proceeded in complete oblivion of the emphatic statements of the critical school that this feature is but the "swaddling clothes of criticism." One of the famous episodes of this line of argument was supplied by the work of Wiener and Dahse, who undertook to show that Septuagintal readings call very seriously in question the reliability of the Hebrew text in this regard, hence analysis based on the divine names is worthless; and thus Mosaic authorship is established. In other words, as the position was facetiously summarized at the time, our Pentateuch is so completely unreliable as to compel belief!²⁹

A more sane treatment is that of Cassuto.³⁰ who, in a careful study of the different lines of evidence for the critical analysis, gives one chapter to this question and advances the theory that the Yahweh and Elohim strands have come ultimately from two diverse sources, the first Israelite, but the other arising in the international wisdom thought; none the less, he contends for a single authorship.

Related to, though by no means identical with the authoritarian mood of fundamentalists that makes final appeal to the New Testament, is that of conservative Judaism, holding as it does tenaciously to the Mosaic authorship and seeking by various arguments to meet the difficulties which criticism has uncovered.³¹ But obviously the consistent and classic expression of the authoritarian position is the Roman Catholic.

Yet we must be cautious in generalizations about Catholic criticism, for in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it was adventurous and unbelievably free. It will be recalled that Astruc was a devout son of "mother church" and put his findings forward with the offer to withdraw them if they should be adjudged contrary to dogma.³² Two other famous names from that period are Richard Simon and Alexander Geddes, both of whom made important contributions to scholarship. However, in the great discussions from Eichhorn to Wellhausen, Catholic scholars took no part. But by the end of the century they could not avoid a deep interest in the findings of the so-called Wellhausen school. Pentateuchal analysis was freely discussed and, as a sample of the astonishing distance Catholic thought had gone, one may cite the position of Van Hoonacker,³³ who taught freely the composite character of the Hexateuch and identified four major literary strands which he designated by the critical symbols, though differing from Protestant scholars in some details of analysis and in assigned dates, holding as he did for the priority of P to the legislation of Deuteronomy. But the Roman church became alarmed over what it called Modernism. The decisions of the Biblical Commission began to appear in 1905; its responses of June 27, 1906, decreed that critical arguments are not sufficient to "justify the statement that these books (of the Pentateuch) have not Moses for their author;" however, "granted the substantial Mosaic authenticity and integrity of the Pentateuch, it may

be admitted that in the long course of centuries some modifications may have been introduced into the work, such as additions after the death of Moses. . .³⁴ These decrees have restrained Biblical criticism to this day. They have resulted in hidebound traditionalism such as Kortleitner adequately exemplifies;³⁵ they have produced also the pathetic theory of Bea that the different styles in the Pentateuch are to be accounted for as expressing Moses' differing moods.³⁶ But happily the church possesses also the more enlightened leadership of Jean Coppens. True, he celebrates the demise of Wellhausenism, but at the same time shows himself deeply persuaded of the truth of much of its findings. His charges against the documentary theory are three. We have already spoken of his claim that it is dominated by a rigid evolutionary theory. In addition he holds that it denies the supernatural and that it "professes an absolute skepticism in regard to the Sacred Books which purport to give the history of the Chosen People."³⁷ This latter certainly is not now true, and even of the time of Wellhausen it must be regarded as a gross exaggeration. And in claiming that the critics deny the supernatural, Coppens joins hands, as in some other matters, with Protestant fundamentalists. Obviously the charge calls for a flat denial. It is true that the critical school, in general, repudiates both Roman Catholic and fundamentalist theories of the supernatural. But this is a very different matter. As too often in dogma, these folk identify their views with the total of truth in this immense and mysterious area of reality. To hold a theistic view of the universe is to believe in the supernatural;³⁸ but this is not to accede to cheap Catholic "miracles" or fundamentalist intellectual gymnastics that overcome all difficulties by the simple device of closing one's eyes and taking a leap in the dark.

There remains then that group of attacks on, or reconsiderations of, the documentary theory, which I have called the

critical. But not to weary with excessive detail, I shall limit discussion to the two matters which certainly are best known and also have proven most significant for criticism. These relate to Deuteronomy and the E document.

The accepted critical view, generally held since the days of DeWette, that Deuteronomy in whole or in part is to be identified with the law book on which King Josiah based his reform in 622, has been attacked from two sides. Hölscher, Kennett, and Berry argue that the code comes from the latter part of the sixth century; Welch and Oestreicher say that it is from a time early in the kingdoms.³⁹ And obviously certain Jewish quarters welcome this view, go one better, and say in effect, Why stop there? Go all the way back to the correct date while at it: back to Moses! The seriousness of the attack will be apparent. For while Wellhausen claimed that he did not base his argument on his dating of Deuteronomy in the latter part of "the Assyrian period," while, too, present day critics doubtless would not feel that this dating is indispensable for their conclusions, yet beyond question the position is important. However, neither of these heretical views has won any considerable defections from critical orthodoxy; and more recently a little fresh evidence has been presented to show objectively that the later dating, at least, is out of the question.⁴⁰

The attack on the E document is the work of Rudolph and Volz, who collaborated in a study of the alleged document in Genesis, while Rudolph alone carried the matter throughout the rest of the Hexateuch.⁴¹ For them E is a figment of the critics' imagination. The material so designated consists in part of a series of glosses lacking the coherence to be considered a document; for the rest, it belongs variously in J and P. It will be seen that this is, in a measure, a return to views held before Hupfeld, or even before Ilgen. But it will be well to turn again

to S. R. Driver; In the first edition of his Introduction (1891, p. 109), he writes:

"Is it probable that there should have been two narratives of the patriarchal and Mosaic ages, independent, yet largely resembling each other, and that these narratives should have been combined together into a single whole at a relatively early period of the history of Israel . . . ? The writer has often considered these questions; but while readily admitting the liability to error, which, from the literary character of the narrative, accompanies the assignment of particular verses to J or E, . . . he must own that he has always risen from the study of "JE" with the conviction that it is composite; and that passages frequently occur in juxtaposition which nevertheless contain indications of not being the work of one and the same hand."

However, the claims of Rudolph and Volz constituted the critical sensation of their time. They were debated widely. In the end, they won the adherence of some, and perhaps even convinced others that their claim for glossing in the Hexateuch, just as elsewhere, is reasonable. Yet if one may venture a sweeping generalization, they did not attract general support to their theory or achieve a revolution in Hexateuchal criticism.

And there the matter rests. The keen debate, the adverse criticism, and the reconsideration of generally accepted views which characterized the advance of criticism through the nineteenth century has never slackened. The so-called Wellhausen hypothesis won a remarkable success in the first decades of its history, yet it was, and is always, compelled to make good its claims against objectors and opponents. And far from resenting, we must heartily welcome these criticisms—in so far as they are sufficiently free of obscurantist theories to promise any light upon the problem. No one today would claim that we know all about the origin and development of the Hexateuch. Every critic in this field realizes fully that in large areas the evidence is far from conclusive; the most one can

claim is to have done his best with such evidence as exists. Surely it is time to quote Driver again! He says,

"In the critical study of the Old Testament, there is an important distinction, which should be kept in mind. It is that of the *degrees of probability* . . . It has been no part of my object to represent conclusions as more certain than is authorized by the facts upon which they depend."²

Admitting freely all this, recognizing, too, the absurdities that have been perpetrated in the name of the JEDP theory, critics of the Hexateuch today, none the less, hold that it is still the best account we possess of the origin and nature of this body of literature. The qualifications and criticisms which I have been at pains to survey fairly have not meant the defection of any significant body of scholarship from essentially the position associated with Wellhausen's name. It is jeered at and ridiculed; its opponents celebrate its death and burial. But it is a very lively corpse. Probably one of the best of such premature obsequies, certainly one of the best informed, is the work of Coppens. Yet the striking fact is that in his sketch of contemporary trends he is utterly mistaken, if not unfair. He ignores standard works such as Eissfeldt's *Einleitung* and Oesterley and Robinson's *Introduction*; he distorts the clear meaning of Hempel in *Die Althebräische Literatur*; he magnifies discussions that most of us consider negligible: and all in the effort to show that the restraint of his church is justified now in the outcome since criticism is swinging back, so he alleges, to the position Catholicism has steadily maintained. He is whistling to keep up his courage! No such trend exists. It would be tedious merely to list the names of first rank scholars of the present day who endorse the familiar documentary theory. Further, it is a notable fact that opponents quite commonly, save for extremists such as Allis, are compelled to admit the composite character of the Pentateuch, and not infrequently ar-

rive at a solution not unlike the documentary theory.⁴³ It perhaps deserves comment also that, while some of the "anti-critical" work is intellectually respectable,⁴⁴ yet a very large bulk of it, and not infrequently the most vociferous, is superficial; by comparison with the serious and meticulous work of the critical school in formulating the theory through a hundred years, it can be adjudged only trivial.⁴⁵ No informed person can doubt or deny that in its essence—that is, ignoring excesses and extremes and allowing for many individual diversities of detail—the documentary theory is now the established scholarly view of the origin and formation of the Hexateuch. To borrow a not too happy phrase of a previous day, it is one of "the assured results of scholarship."

Yet, however important this may be adjudged, it is of minor significance beside other aspects of our heritage from the great critical activity of the past century. The documentary theory was revolutionary of our understanding of Israel's history and religious development; and it stands as a great bulwark against a recrudescence of the notions from which it delivered us. Yet, as we have commented and as we have shown from Kuenen, Wellhausen's outstanding contribution is best seen in terms of method. He attained his results by a faithful application of the uses of evidence; he assembled relevant facts and built a reasoned construction upon them. And this is the outstanding characteristic of the subsequent critical movement. Some charge that the movement is "rationalistic." In the non-technical sense of the term, that is its meaning and boast. It proceeds in the firm faith that the Universe is rational and that the reasoning powers of the human mind are adequate to some dependable understanding of it; one need ponder but a moment to realize that this is the basic assumption and character of modern Biblical criticism. And this is its great contribution to our day. What it has accomplished for

religious thinking becomes apparent on examination of, say, Colenso's account of his spiritual pilgrimage. The hesitation, the perplexity, the religious misgivings with which he followed the stern logic of facts are a voice from another world, though separated from us by but little more than eighty years. He says,

"But I was thus driven—against my will at first, I may truly say—to search more deeply into these questions; and I have since done so, to the best of my power . . . And now I tremble at the result of my enquiries, rather I should do so, were it not that I believe firmly in a God of Righteousness and Truth and Love, who 'IS and is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.' Should all else give way beneath me, I feel that His everlasting Arms are still under me." (Op. cit., p. 7)

He "trembled" because in sincere study he had become convinced that there are errors of fact in the Biblical record! It is a situation that well demonstrates the liberty into which in our day, we have come, a liberty from ancient error that in turn has directed us more clearly to the centre and essentials of religious faith. The new world of the spirit in which we live has been discovered through the courageous adventure, but, too, through the intellectual clarity and honesty of the generation of which we are speaking. And, allowing for the immense impact of general scientific thinking upon them, our point now is that the methods and the findings of Biblical criticism have been foremost in this revolution. Today when, partly as a result of war conditions, partly through the specious appeal of "the new orthodoxy," the mood of the irrational again threatens us, here is the great significance of Biblical criticism: it is a symbol and bulwark of faith in the rationality of the universe, and of the validity of human thinking.

But there is still more. The contrast between the courageous adventure of Colenso and Jean Astruc's ready offer to withdraw his conclusions if they should be adjudged contrary to his church's dogma reveals in a

brilliant flash the inner meaning and historic significance of Protestantism.⁴⁶ Briefly our Protestant heritage is freedom: freedom to search truth in whatever area it may be found; and freedom to follow that truth in honest conviction. What need to point the priceless worth of this! The whole long course of human history may from one point of view be regarded as the epic of the human soul, a struggle for freedom from political tyranny, from economic blight, and freedom from the clammy hand of the past that in custom, code, or dogma would stultify discovery, throttle advance, and debase us to the status of slaves of dead ideas and self-centered institutions. All the greatness and glory of the modern age have been possible only through the freedom we have won. They are inconceivable apart from the spiritual achievement associated with the name of Martin Luther. Modern Biblical criticism was born in the Protestant Reformation. The achievements of the great age of Wellhausen were but the logical and spiritual fruition of forces inherent in that movement. Here is the ultimate significance of the name of Wellhausen. He and his contemporaries are a symbol of the freedom of the human mind and spirit. In all its excesses, its mistakes and absurdities, but too in its remarkable achievement with far-reaching promise, their activity was a typical piece of Protestantism. For Protestantism is but fallible man seeking truth in belief and practice. It is man in his weakness and foolishness but in his faith and his promise of a glorious future.

In a day of the mightiest assault on the progress of the centuries which all history has witnessed surely no more is needed than to point out that Nazism and Japanese divine kingship are not our ultimate foes. Indeed, their defeat will but clarify the issue which is being steadily drawn more closely between those in our midst who would regiment us in eternal slavery to dogma and institution and those who regard life as a glorious adventure of bound-

less truth. Full well may we ponder the injunction of St. Paul, mistranslated though it doubtless is, "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ Jesus has made you free." We must hold ever before ourselves the profound words of the Gospel of John, "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

NOTES

- ¹Benjamin Kidd in *ERE* iv 403b.
- ²*An Historico-critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch*, by A. Kuenen, translated by Philip K. Wicksteed, London; Macmillan and Co., 1886, pp. xi-xii.
- ³*The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined*, by the Right Rev. John William Colenso, Bishop of Natal, New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1863, p. 5, 7.
- ⁴Kuenen, *op. cit.* pp. xvii-xviii.
- ⁵*op. cit.* p. xxiii.
- ⁶*id.*, pp. 392-450; 531-602; completed 1877, pp. 407-479; republished in 1884 in *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*.
- ⁷English translation: *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, with a reprint of the article "Israel" from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, by Julius Wellhausen, translated from the German under the author's supervision by J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies, with Preface by W. Robertson Smith. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, mdccclxxxv.
- ⁸*op. cit.* p. xxxix.
- ⁹*Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, 1885, pp. v-vi.
- ¹⁰For reasons that will be obvious, the horizons of this sketch are limited severely to Wellhausen's work on the Hexateuch. It must not be overlooked, however, that in both the Arabic and the New Testament fields he made contributions of far-reaching importance.
- ¹¹*Prolegomena* (English translation), p. 13.
- ¹²*The Old Testament and the Critics*, Paterson, St. Anthony Guild Press, 1942, pp. 25, 27ff.
- ¹³*From the Stone Age to Christianity*, Johns Hopkins Press, 1940, p. 53.
- ¹⁴*Prolegomena*. English translation. pp. 12, 13.
- ¹⁵William Vatke: *Histories of Kritische Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1886) pp. 392-403.
- ¹⁶*Introduction*, 1891, pp. 120, 135.
- ¹⁷M. C. D'Arcy, "Exegetical Method of History in Modern Times" (in *European Civilization, Its Origin and Development*, edited by Edward Eyre), 1937, p. 1084.
- ¹⁸A. T. Olmstead, "History, Ancient World, and the Bible," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 2 (1943) : 134, N. B. pp. 11-12.
- ¹⁹D. B. McDonald, *The Hebrew Literary Genius*, 1933, pp. 96ff.
- ²⁰*Studien zur Kritik und Erklärung der Biblische Urgeschichte*.
- ²¹*Urgeschichte*.
- ²²*Die Erzählung des Hexateuchs auf ihre Quellen untersucht*.
- ²³Julian Morgenstern, "The Oldest Document in the Hexateuch," *Hebrew Union College Annual* IV, 1927, pp. 1-138.

²⁴Sigmund Mowinckel, *The Two Sources of the Predeuteronomic Primeval History* (JE) in Gen. 1-11, Oslo, 1937.

²⁵William H. Green, *The Pentateuch Vindicated from the Aspersions of Bishop Colenso*, New York, 1863.

²⁶See, in particular, his *Old Testament Altars, The Main Problem of Deuteronomy, and Pentateuchal Studies*.

²⁷John Cumming, *Moses Right and Bishop Colenso Wrong*, New York, 1863, p. 18.

²⁸Oswald T. Allis, *The Five Books of Moses*, Philadelphia, 1943, pp. 246ff.

²⁹Johannes Dahse, *Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage*, 1912; Harold M. Wiener, *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, 1909. See the reply by John Skinner, *The Divine Names in Genesis*, 1914; and by Eduard König, *Die moderne Pentateuchkritik und ihre neueste Bekämpfung*, 1914.

³⁰Umberto Cassuto, *La Questione della Genesi*, Firenze, 1934.

³¹Joseph Reider, *Deuteronomy*, Philadelphia, 1937, pp. 16-29. Solomon Goldman, *The Golden Chain*, v. 1, pt. 1, 1937, pp. 99-100.

³²Edward M. Gray, *Old Testament Criticisms*, 1923, pp. 239-41.

³³J. Coppens, *Le Chanoine Albin Van Hoonacker*, 1935, pp. 67-77.

³⁴Michael Seisenberger, *Practical Handbook for the Study of the Bible*, 1925, p. 482.

³⁵F. X. Kortleitner, *Commentationes Biblicae*, 1927.

³⁶A. Bea, *Institutiones Biblicae Scholis Accommodatae de Pentateucho*, 1928.

³⁷J. Coppens, *The Old Testament and the Critics*, translated by Edward A. Ryan and Edward W. Tribbe, 1942, pp. 25ff.

³⁸Cf. J. E. McFadyen, *Old Testament Critic and the Christian Church*, 1903. Chap. ix, especially pp. 242 ff.

³⁹For a summary of these positions and for bibliography, see Bewer, Paton, and Dahl. "The Problem of Deuteronomy," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xlvii, 1928, pp. 358-379.

⁴⁰"An Objective Criterion for the Dating of Deuteronomy," *AJSL*, lvi, 1939, pp. 337-349.

⁴¹Paul Volz and Wilhelm Rudolph, *Der Elohists als Erzähler, ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik*, 1933; Wilhelm Rudolph, *Der Elohists von Exodus bis Joshua*, 1938.

⁴²*Op. cit.*, p. 12.

⁴³For example, Eerdmans, *Alttestamentliche Studien*, 1908. Note, too, how Cassuto is of the view that Genesis is like a building constructed of stones from various quarries and older buildings: *op. cit.*, pp. 393ff.

⁴⁴Probably the best of these are the studies of Eerdmans and of Cassuto, though Coppens' deserves attention also.

⁴⁵An example is A. Noortdzy, *The Old Testament Problem*, translated from the Dutch by Miner B. Stearns, 1941.

⁴⁶Cf. McFadyen, *op. cit.* ch. vii.

Wellhausen on the Synoptic Gospels: A Centenary Appraisal

ALLEN WIKGREN

In his interesting paper on "The Significance of Julius Wellhausen,"¹ Professor W. A. Irwin chose to limit himself mainly to an estimate of that eminent scholar's contribution to Pentateuchal criticism. The following observations are offered as a complement to this treatment in the conviction that a centennial memorialization should also give adequate recognition to Wellhausen's achievements in the area of New Testament studies.² For, after some forty years or more of tramping and trail-blazing in the Old Testament wilderness, he turned seriously to the New Testament terrain for a bit of similar exercise and endeavor. Such matters as eschatology and Aramaic gospels had, to be sure, already engaged his attention before the turn of the century,³ but it

was between 1903 and 1908 that he published his introduction to the Synoptic Gospels, commentaries on all four Gospels, and an analysis of the Apocalypse of John.⁴ I have chosen to limit my attention mainly to certain areas of Synoptic study where I believe that J. Wellhausen's work has been most stimulating and valuable.

With regard to the cultural milieu and dominating forces of the period of Wellhausen's life we are quite content to refer to Professor Irwin's excellent depiction and analysis. Suffice it here in addition to observe that Wellhausen's objectivity and freedom of inquiry did not desert him in his New Testament studies; that he coupled his usual independence of procedure with a knowledge and use of the results of previous critical research in the areas under consideration; and that he lived in a period of no less revolutionary significance for New than for Old Testament study, such influences as those of Strauss' *Leben Jesu*, of the establishment of the priority of Mark and of concomitant synoptic studies, of the schools of Tübingen criticism and of radical eschatology, and of the new knowledge and estimate of the character of "biblical" Greek being some of the major and inescapable forces of his time.

We may observe, first of all, that Wellhausen displays a commendable interest in the basic text of his documents, and that his independence has in this area led him to certain conclusions which in somewhat less exaggerated form we think of as quite modern. There are, it is true, some elements of weakness in his textual criticism, as we shall note. One of these, which should be mentioned at the outset, is his limited citation of evidence for readings. He quotes

¹Read before a joint session of the Mid-Western Branch of the NABI and the Chicago Society of Biblical Research at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, January 15, 1944, and published in the present number of *The Journal of Bible and Religion*.

²This material was presented in substantially its present form before the Mid-West Section of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in its joint session with the Middle West Branch of the American Oriental Society and the Chicago Society of Biblical Research, The University of Chicago, April 15, 1944.

³E.g., in *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* (1884) and *Israelitisch und jüdische Geschichte* (1894).

⁴*Einleitung in der drei ersten Evangelien* (Berlin, 1903; 2d. ed., 1911), *Das Evangelium Marci* (Berlin, 1903; 2nd ed., 1909), *Das Evangelium Mattaei* (Berlin 1904), *Das Evangelium Lucae* (Berlin, 1904), *Das Evangelium Johannis* (Berlin, 1908), *Analyse des Offenbarung Johannis und Erweiterungen und Änderungen im vierten Evangelium* (Berlin, 1907). Later he published two series of notes on Acts: *Noten zur Apostelgeschichte* (1914 and 1917). It may be noted that the works on the Gospels usually referred to as "commentaries" are hardly comprehensive enough, except perhaps in the case of Mark, to deserve that title as it is ordinarily used. Wellhausen gives place and emphasis mainly to points of particular interest to himself. Moreover, a knowledge of the content of the *Einleitung* is presupposed in the other volumes, and of the Marcan volume in the other Gospels.

only the chief uncials, the "old" versions, i.e., old Latin and Syriac, and, quite secondarily and fragmentarily, the Fathers; and his eclecticism goes even further in that his attention is focused for the most part on the codices, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and Cantabrigiensis (Bezae), and the old Latin and Syriac. Rarely does he cite complete uncial evidence for or against a reading.⁵ Within this restricted range, however, he gives careful attention to textual variants; and the general theory upon which he proceeds is worthy of notice and commendation.

This theory, as we have intimated, anticipates a viewpoint which, in less extreme fashion, has come to be increasingly accepted in our day among textual critics of the New Testament. It may be summarized in two main directions. (1) An independence of the Westcott and Hort "neutral" text. Wellhausen recognized, as we do today, that this text represents to a certain extent a learned recension, and he felt, besides, that the so-called "occidental" text had been much less influenced by such revision and was consequently closer to the original.⁶ Incidentally we may note here that he points out the unsuitability of the name "western" for this text. (2) A disposition to attach much more weight than is commonly given to the intrinsic evidence for or against a particular reading. Wellhausen rightly emphasized the fact that the

earliest transmission of the text must have been very free, the attention of the transmitters being focused upon the sense rather than upon the exact letter of the *paradosis*. A choice, then, he affirms, between the readings of groups like B and S on the one hand and D and the oldest versions on the other must proceed at least in part in view of the exegesis of the particular passage and the style of the individual writer.⁷ In this connection it is interesting to observe that Wellhausen leaned pretty heavily upon recensions as a means of explaining differences in the Synoptic Gospels.

Wellhausen's expression of these two general viewpoints is restrained enough, and he disavows any extremism in the other direction from Westcott and Hort; yet in his actual practice a weakness or two appear. He is thus apt too frequently to favor or adopt a reading of only one of his favorite witnesses (D. old Latin and Syriac), where such a reading, in his opinion, makes the best sense.⁸ And where two or three of these are gathered together the vote is decisive. One manuscript with Wellhausen can often chase a thousand, and two can put ten thousand to flight. But, then, this reminds one a bit of Westcott and Hort. In these instances Bengel's *praestat ardua* does not seem to have exercised much influence on Wellhausen, but he employs a somewhat related criterion for his criticism which merits mention and qualification, namely, that the reading which is most non-literary and most Semitic in character is likely to be the closest to the original. With one side of this touchstone, carefully used, we have no particular quarrel; in regard to the second, however, we are apt to feel that Wellhausen has not taken into sufficient consideration the possibility of conformation of the text to biblical or Septuagint style, such as is abundantly exemplified in the Lucan writings,⁹ and his neglect of minuscule and other evidence precludes the use of variants which may explain readings otherwise considered

⁵E.g., he notes that Luke 22:43f. is omitted by S B Syrsin. But many other MSS and versions in part omit, including the uncials A R T W. Actually the verses are read by the first hand of S and omitted by Sa.

⁶Wellhausen indicates at some length (*Einleitung*, p. 5, note) that he would prefer as a text an edition of B or other objective witness together with a critical apparatus.

⁷His exact words are as follows: Die Wahl zwischen den Lesarten des Vaticanus und des Sinaiticus auf der einen, des Cantabrigiensis Bezae und der ältesten Versionen auf der anderen Seite hat sich zum Teil nach der Exegese der einzelnen Stelle zu richten oder nach der Art des einzelnen Schriftstellers" (*Einleitung*, p. 6).

⁸E.g., Luke 19:29. (ton Pharisaion).

⁹Elsewhere he recognized this influence, however, and cited several instances of where in D the text of Luke has been revised in the direction of better Greek.

explicable only through hypothetic Semitic originals.¹⁰ Such a dictum as "ungriechisch und darum wol richtig"¹¹ certainly deserves some slight modification!

But let us look now more closely at Wellhausen's general views upon this question of Semitic influences. For in this area we are dealing with a scholar of outstanding competence and with one who has made a primary and enduring contribution to our knowledge and appreciation of such Semitic characteristics as are to be found in the Greek of the Gospels. There is much truth in Professor Burkitt's observation that "You have only to read Professor Wellhausen's short commentaries on the synoptic gospels to see how many things are immediately clear to one who has a thorough command of Aramaic, which are only half-perceived by less fully equipped scholars."¹² And we are glad to bring this commendation of Aramaic study to the attention of students of the New Testament, although also regretfully recognizing that on the part of some of our contemporary Semitic savants, who have felt the call to enlighten the New Testament scholarship of our day, "over-perception" may be as great a danger as "half-perception."

That Wellhausen was relatively free from such danger is due to his critically adequate conceptions of the nature and composition of the gospels and to certain other insights

which effected an ameliorative qualification of his general viewpoint. For, although he believed with several of his predecessors and contemporaries that an Aramaic form of the gospel lay behind Mark and the second source document, "Q,"¹³ yet he does not assume that the one was identical with our Mark, nor that the other was necessarily used in Aramaic by the writers of Matthew and Luke. He states, in fact, that, although Matthew and Luke may have known the Aramaic text of Mark, they in general used the Greek, and that their "Q" source lay before them in Greek as well as possibly in Aramaic! He also recognized here the influence of "Biblicisms" in Matthew and Luke, suggesting, for example, that the introductory Lucan hymns could very well be Greek compositions based upon biblical reminiscences. Furthermore, and to his special credit in view of the historical period of his labors, he recognized the *koine* character of New Testament Greek in general, and, in particular, in the Synoptics and especially Mark he posited a non-literary dialect of the lower classes such as is reflected, he felt, in certain papyri and in the Septuagint. However, he attempts to resolve any apparent contradiction between this and his other views by observing that the relatively simple, non-periodizing, anacoluthonic phraseology of popular Greek might well coincide with Semitic style. Yet, he admits, at the same time, that these characteristics are no indication of a particular language, but reflect the oral diction of the common man. Finally, we observe with no little interest that he utters a prophetic caution against the process of discovering new sensational readings through retroversion.¹⁴

There are, however, two main negative criticisms that should be added here to what was said in connection with Wellhausen's textual operations. The first has to do with his actual praxis. For in spite of his general appreciation of the *koine* character of New Testament Greek, Wellhausen in

¹⁰This criticism has been recently and clearly stated by Professor F. C. Grant in his evaluation of the work of Professor Torrey in *The Earliest Gospel*, New York and Nashville, 1943, chap. VI,

¹¹*Das Evangelium Matthaei*, p. 25.

¹²*The Gospel History and Its Transmission*, 3rd ed., Edinburgh, 1906.

¹³A summary of the philological evidence is given in the *Einleitung*, pp. 10-32.

¹⁴This passage is worth quoting "Die Missverständnisse, die den Evangelisten zugeschrieben werden, sind gewöhnliche solche der Ausleger. Man muss sich hüten, durch Retroversion ganz neue sensationelle Aussagen zu gewinnen, die dem griechischen Wortlaut ins Gesicht schlagen. Unsere Evangelisten standen der Zeit Jesu viel näher als wir und verstanden vor allem viel besser aramäisch. Sie verfehlten den aramäischen Sinn nicht leicht, wenn gleich sie ihn oft zu wörtlich und darum unverständlich übersetzen." *Einleitung*, p. 28.

his treatment of particular passages does not display any great acquaintance with this Greek nor any overwhelming desire to use it as a control. True, he cites a few parallels from Epictetus and one or two other Hellenistic writers, but elsewhere and too generally in his comments upon the text he appears to reflect an overly rigid and classical conception of what the Greek ought to be, a conception apparently mediated to him through Blass.¹⁵ The second criticism involves a question of consistency. For it appears that Wellhausen's supposition of an Aramaic gospel similar to Mark when viewed along with his conception of the process of gospel composition and his evaluation of the nature and date of the gospels and of their written sources places him in a somewhat anomalous position. Through critical acumen he had reached or supported those conclusions on the date and composition of the Gospels which are generally accepted by New Testament scholarship today. But it is difficult to see how he could reconcile a view that Mark was composed after 70 A.D. and that "Q" was later than

Mark and composed sometime after the destruction of Jerusalem with the hypothesis that these documents were composed or written in Aramaic.¹⁶

We come, then, to the vitally interesting question suggested by this matter of Semitic backgrounds, namely, that of Wellhausen's conception of the nature of the Gospels and of the person of the Jesus therein portrayed. We cannot attempt here to delineate his views in detail, except, perhaps, on a point or two; but no adequate appraisal of the influence and significance of his work can leave these out of consideration. Moreover, the problems encountered in this area are as disturbing to our generation as they were to his.

Wellhausen's viewpoint here may be generally characterized as one of radical liberalism. Although not given to much quotation of the opinions of others, it is clear that he is acquainted with the best critical New Testament scholarship up to his time and was influenced a great deal by the work of men like Strauss—to whom he probably refers more than to anyone else—, Schleiermacher, Wrede, Loisy, and Lietzmann, as well as of others of more moderate position such as Bousset, J. E. Carpenter, Pheiderer, H. J. Holtzmann, Bernard Weiss, and, excepting especially eschatology, Johannes Weiss. Again, however, we find forceful and independent statements of such conclusions as he reaches, together with valuable and suggestive details of interpretation which have commanded the wide attention and respect of scholars ever since their promulgation.

For Wellhausen the gospel (euangelion) represents an apostolic, post-resurrection message of salvation, and he doubts that Jesus himself used the word or its equivalent.¹⁷ It is not primarily teaching, but news about Jesus Christ. "Er ist das Objekt, und das Evangelium handelt über ihm als den Christus."¹⁸ As in Paul so in Mark: Jesus throughout is the crucified, resur-

¹⁵An example or two will illustrate this. On Luke 19:40 he writes that the future tense with *ean* "scheint keine mögliche" and refers to Blass. But this is common in later Hellenistic Greek! In Mark 15:13 and elsewhere he indicates that *palin* may mean not "again but" "weiter," "dar-auf." But this is Greek and found, e.g., commonly in a writer like Epictetus. It is difficult to believe that Wellhausen was unacquainted with the work of Moulton; but he does not appear to display any use of it, although it should have been available to him for the second edition of the *Einleitung*, published in 1911.

¹⁶As an indication of the strong influence exerted by Wellhausen's opinions one might cite the fact that B. W. Bacon seized upon his interesting aberration here to illustrate the point that translation Greek need not be early. (*The Gospel of Mark*, p. 60).

¹⁷Wellhausen's general position may be best gauged through the statements he makes in his *Excursus* on "The Gospel and Christianity," and "The Gospel and Jesus of Nazareth" in the *Einleitung* volume.

¹⁸*Einleitung*, p. 99. Cf. Professor D. W. Riddle's recent statement of the same point of view in his paper, "The Central Problem of the Gospels," read before the Mid-West Section of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, November 8, 1940, and published in *The Journal of Biblical Literature*, LX (1941), 97-111.

rected and glorified Christ. The message of John the Baptist and presumably of Jesus was not really "good news," and therefore the Christian "gospel" in Mark is a prolepsis. Jesus was not a Christian, but a Jew. The gospel as the good news of salvation was first preached by the apostles after the death of Jesus; and it was predicated, as in the case of Paul, upon a conviction of the resurrection resulting from an ecstatic experience and Christophany. The belief in the Parousia with all its concomitant conceptions is later, and is based upon the resurrection experience. It was therefore, non-extant in Jesus' lifetime, and is in the gospels a "projection backwards"—a word like "retrojection" is needed in English—of the belief of the early church. According to the Gospels the meaning of "the kingdom" as used by Jesus was not that of a future, heaven-revealed domain, but of a condition already present as well as future. But Jesus himself is not actually the proclaimer of this "kingdom" either, for in the Gospels it is nothing more or less than the "church" (ekklesia), a reflection again of the later Christian consciousness. Attempts of Protestant theologians to distinguish the "Kingdom of God" and "the Church" are, therefore, futile.

So far as the person of Jesus himself is concerned, Wellhausen affirmed that the question of whether and in what sense he held himself to be the Messiah constituted the most vital problem in the study of his life.¹⁹ However, he simply denies to Jesus

any sort of Messianic self-ascription. Differentiating sharply between the Jewish and Christian messianic hopes, he adduces convincing evidence to indicate that even if Jesus had been acclaimed as Messiah it would have been in a Jewish sense. The confession of Peter may still be historical, but not as it stands. In the Galilean period, however, according to Mark, Jesus is not described as the Messiah. With Lietzmann Wellhausen denies that Jesus used the title "Son of Man" of himself. It was a Christian designation, though even Paul did not use it.²⁰ Through the crucifixion the old Messiah disappeared; through the resurrection the new became alive, the Christian Messiah, who is portrayed in Matthew as Messiah from the beginning and as founder of the basileia equals ekklesia or the kingdom "==" the church.

Since Wellhausen believed, as do the more radical exponents of the form-history school of our day, that what we can know of Jesus' religious personality is a reflex mediated to us through Christian faith, he is naturally a bit vague as to his own views on this point. He professes, nevertheless, to think of Jesus as a prophet of repentance who was concerned about national emancipation from priestly and scribal tradition and who protested against the illusion on the part of the Jews that the approaching kingdom and judgment would automatically bring about a realization of their national hopes. He, therefore, neither dealt with political issues nor gave assent to the view that the Kingdom of God was Davidic and the Messiah David's son. Furthermore, the impression of his personality was greater than that of his teaching, and when he was discredited by death—Wellhausen writes here as though having in mind either Messianic claims or ascriptions—this impression of his person was enhanced by martyrdom and he lived again as Messiah.²¹

Much of this last appears rather tenuous and inconclusive, but it was seemingly the

¹⁹See here especially his summaries in the *Einleitung* entitled, "The Jewish and the Christian Messiah" (pp. 79-84), "The Jewish and Christian Eschatology" (pp. 86-98), and "Son of Man" (pp. 123-130).

²⁰Wellhausen sought to explain its attribution to Jesus with messianic meaning as derived from the statements in Mark 2:10 and 28 (see the *Einleitung*, p. 129 and *Das Evangelium Marci, ad loc.*). But he also assumes a currency of the term as reflected in Daniel and the Enochic passages.

²¹Wellhausen gives passing commendation to the view of Reimarus, that Jesus was an agitator who unsuccessfully sought to play the role of a political messiah, as one of at least psychological and historical possibility.

best Wellhausen could do after rejecting entirely the eschatological interpretation of J. Weiss and Schweitzer, as well as the prevailing rationalization of Jesus based upon the Marcan hypothesis and impugned along with it by Wrede in his *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den evangelien*.²² In particular, his explanation—if it can be so called—of the Christophanies seems inadequate. Insufficient weight is given the late Jewish apocalyptic views which he himself well, though briefly, describes. He rather inconsistently maintains that the distinction in usage of the term “son of man” as the equivalent of “man” and as a Messianic title, respectively, had been first made in the Jewish rather than Greek-speaking Christian community, although previously arguing that Jesus could not have used the term as a title because in Aramaic it could only mean “man.” On this point his learned contemporary, Dalman, disagreed with him. A particularly difficult position seems to result from rejecting all Messianic convictions and an extraordinary amount of the teaching of Jesus, and then positing the subsequent Christian faith primarily upon the impression of his personality. A person potent

might well have exercised his powers through some of the insights and convictions which Wellhausen would deny to him entirely because they are colored by later Christian beliefs. His main difficulty lies here in an extremism which arbitrarily regards passages as *wholly* unauthentic if they reflect a later situation or are of a later date in appearance than Mark.

Beset by certain weaknesses as some of Wellhausen's conclusions may have been in these matters, they, nevertheless, were generally based upon a keen and independent evaluation of the relevant texts which in itself constitutes a most valuable and continuing contribution to our knowledge and estimate of the Gospels. And here, together especially with William Wrede, he also contributed firmly to establish what was in their day a new conception of the Gospel of Mark and a more adequate understanding of the formulation and transmission of the gospel tradition.²³ His observations on chronology, topography, tendenz and the relationships between sentences and sections, and his identification of redactional, transitional, and other secondary data in the texts showed conclusively the path which gospel study must take. Thus he not only prepared the way for so-called “form-criticism,” but the latter in its various manifestations may be described—without any detracting from the great value of its contributions—as an elaboration, modification and systematization of his methods and conclusions.²⁴

Wellhausen's ideas upon certain other related subjects of importance to him he has gathered together in the topics discussed in the *Einleitung*. Those not already mentioned deal with the date of the crucifixion, John the Baptist and Jesus, the Twelve, The Gospel of the Hebrews, Zacharias son of Barachias, and the “Q” source. Relative to the latter he takes the almost unique position, as we have briefly intimated, of the absolute priority of Mark, as did Wilke

²²Göttingen, 1901. This work apparently had a great influence on Wellhausen.

²³Wrede's was the first influential attack (*Op. cit.*) on the Marcan hypothesis. He raised questions about Mark's historical accuracy, indicated the artificiality of the framework, noted that the Gospel was made up of discrete stories and sayings, and elaborated a view that Mark was written under the influence of a doctrinal theory, which he called the “Messianic secret.” He gives his major attention to the last, however, and regards most of the pericopes as trustworthy.

²⁴Cf., e.g., this statement on Mark: “Mc gibt keine Geschichte Jesu, es fehlt die Chronologie und der pragmatische Faden, auch die Ortsangaben lassen viel zu wünschen übrig. Er sammelt nur lose Stücke, Erzählungen und Aussprüche, ordnet sie und bringt sie in drei Perioden unter.” (*Das Ev. Marci*, p. 8). Interestingly, Wellhausen employs also some of the more technical terminology which became characteristic of the formgeschichtliche Schule, e.g., “apophthegm,” “paradigm,” “novellen,” and “Ich Sage (Cf. Bultmanns ‘Ich Wörter’).” One instance may be cited. Commenting on Mark (*Op. cit.*, p. 12) he says: “Der erste Tag von Kapernaum . . . hat paradigmatische Bedeutung.”

to produce such tremendous consequences

back in the 1830's.²⁵ It is difficult to follow Wellhausen here in his reasons for viewing the data of "Q" as practically all secondary. He supposes that Mark must have gathered up everything authentic and that if there is any observable influence *inter se*—and he thinks there is—it was an influence of Mark on "Q" rather than the contrary, as generally assumed. A belief in the priority of "Q" he regards as a "hangover" from the old view of the priority of Matthew and he rejects the identification of some form of the latter with the *logia* of Papias.

Regarding the other data and the details of his interpretations and suggestions we must be content to observe that they have had in general a noteworthy influence in New Testament study. And one is quite inclined to agree with J. H. Lightfoot's opinion that his work "would perhaps have received an even wider recognition than it

has, had he not been very much in advance of the thought of his time,"²⁶ as well as with the statement, which he quotes from J. M. Creed,²⁷ to the effect that in Wellhausen's commentaries and volume of introduction "are to be found the seeds of most of the more important developments of recent years."²⁸ Other similar testimonials could doubtless be adduced, but we close with the recent observation incidentally made by Professor F. C. Grant in his citation of Marcan bibliography that Wellhausen's contributions in the *Commentary* and *Introduction* "will never be out of date."

Making, then, such individually differing allowances as we may wish for certain vagaries of method, emphasis and interpretation, we can yet agree, I believe, that Julius Wellhausen has performed a work of informative, stimulating and enduring value in the few years in which he devoted himself to this particular area of study. Were it not for the fact that he remains such a monumental figure in the Old Testament sphere, one might be tempted, from the New Testament viewpoint, to refer to him as a great New Testament scholar with a most excellent Old Testament background.²⁹

²⁵Wilke did not get many votes for his viewpoint.

²⁶*History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, New York and London, 1934, p. 22.

²⁷*The Gospel According to St. Luke*, London, 1930, p. vii.

²⁸*Loc. cit.*

²⁹*Op. cit.*, p. 30.

Paul through Jewish Eyes¹

AMOS N. WILDER

THE MODERN WORLD is incessantly recanvassing its traditions and its spiritual foundations, now particularly under the spur of cultural crisis and war, and the Jewish community is even more sensitive than others to this process. The historical relations of Judaism and Christianity become a subject of imperative concern not only in the light of pressing public issues like anti-Semitism and the policy with regard to Palestine but for deeper reasons. For the definition of true Judaism and of true Christianity cannot be dissociated from each other in the more general task today of criticizing our whole culture. Though nearly 2000 years have passed since the beginning of the breach between these faiths, the issues remain the same, and contemporary apologists resume the ancient controversy at the point where Stephen and Saul, and Justin and Trypho left it.

The two books we are concerned with here well suggest in their differences the indecision of Jewry today with regard to the daughter faith. It is impossible here to suggest the countless factors that have modified and diversified modern Judaism. Like all ancient faiths it has been overwhelmed in a tide of secularism, and much of its present-day complaisance toward Christianity is therefore to be put down to a lax indifferentism, though the same shallowness on the part of both faiths accounts for a corresponding shallow hostility. More significant a feature of modern Judaism is the recurrent impulse, native to this faith, to return to the prophetic strain, a return prompted by constant distresses and by acute cultural dilemmas, but also furthered by modern secular influences like historical science and the new biblical study. people, but with the love of the Messiah prevailing over both. Such an insight

throws real light on matters of historical judgment, such as the reason why Paul returned the last time to Jerusalem despite the certain dangers. He did this, says Asch, "because he would not separate himself from the body and community of Israel, though the forces he had set in motion threatened to do it for him. He was bound inwardly with all the strands of his being to the continuity of Israel . . . He was striving to fuse into one person—and this was a gigantic task—the two Pauls, Paul the Jew and Paul the Greek."

(3) The writer, though a Jew, is able to enter sympathetically into his delineation of Paul and of the early Christian faith. He has both the freedom from prejudice and the imagination to recognize Paul's sincerity and greatness.

The chief faults of the book, as they appear to me, I shall list here, and return later to the most important ones in dealing with Klausner. (1) The basic moral character of the conversion of Paul is not properly grasped. It is made to turn mainly on a matter of enlightenment and of remorse for his previous persecutions, and not on the kind of experience described in the seventh chapter in Romans. (2) The picture of the whole Pharisaic party and the scribes as in full sympathy with the new movement is exaggerated. For Asch the Nazarene sect constitutes no breach with Phariseeism. (3) The uncritical use of Acts and the acceptance as genuine of the Pastoral Epistles and even Hebrews, makes for real contradictions and confusions in the attitudes of the chief actors, Peter, Paul, James. Klausner's treatment also has a major defect in his uncritical use of Acts.

We turn now to Klausner's work. It is curious that despite its far superior scholarship and importance, it suffers by compari-

son with *The Apostle* on some central matters. It would be a desirable thing if this major study of the beginnings of Christianity by a leading Jewish scholar could become the occasion for a friendly but searching discussion between Jew and Christian as to their mutual understanding. For the book purposely goes beyond an historical aim into present day issues, as do *The Apostle* and other works of Jewish writers dealing with the same period. Dr. Klausner has been outspoken here in his apologetic and in his negative judgments on Christianity, and has, moreover, fully disclosed a view of historical Judaism which is sufficiently remarkable, so that Christian scholars have every reason to pursue the conversation further. For beneath the ambiguous and tragic relations between the two faiths today lie unclarified assumptions and tacit disagreements which must sometime come to the fore in historical and cultural debate.

There is something fascinating about seeing this spokesman for his people, professor at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, resume the ancient controversy of the synagogue with Paul, whom Nietzsche called the destroyer (Vernichter) of the Law. The issue is even more dramatic than the one involved in Klausner's *Jesus of Nazareth*. For if in the work of Jesus we have the germ from which was to "spring" the pattern of Judaism,—in Klausner's words, "the germ of negation of the ceremonial laws, which was embodied in embryonic form in the teaching of Jesus,"—in Paul we have the mature growth, and the visible irrepressible conflict. "If righteousness is through the law, then Christ died for naught." Here of course it is still insisted that righteousness is through the Law.

Klausner's book is in reality a series of books, so massive is it. Some of the best sections are those that present the background of Paul in the Diaspora, in the Hellenistic literature, and in the Empire. It is a thesis of the book that "Paul and his

Christianity were built out of the ruins of the uprooted Judaism of the Diaspora," and that his success was then founded upon the yearning for individual redemption in the Gentile world. "The secret of his success is that he made use in large measure of those weapons which a paganism anxious for the salvation of the individual placed in his hands; and he added to them the ethical demands, the way of salvation, and the irreconcilability with other religions which Judaism gave him." These elements in Judaism were made palatable and easy for the Gentile through the abrogation of the ceremonial law, and still more attractive by various concessions to Hellenistic paganism.

In Book III Klausner describes Hellenistic Jewish Thought, giving special attention to the *Wisdom of Solomon* and *The Sibylline Oracles*, as well as to Philo. This is one of the most valuable parts of the work. Books IV and V deal rather briefly with the sources, i. e., Acts and the Epistles of Paul, and with the Pre-Pauline period. This period is inadequately treated and the judgments of the author are too scantily supported. It is curious to find Mary Magdalene's resurrection experience presented as the first and decisive one, and her experience evaluated in the light of the fact that she was "hysterical to the point of madness," while Peter was "incurably emotional and visionary." The interpretation of the primitive community is very hasty. Much is made of the fact that Jesus' Messiahship was interpreted in terms of the Servant and of the Heavenly Son of Man as a matter of calculation, since any emphasis on the political Messiah (the real one in Klausner's eyes) would have been dangerous. Klausner has given the transition experiences of the disciples very little attention, and he makes very little distinction between the various traditions of the resurrection. Klausner, moreover, does not recognize the decisive cleavage between the pre-Pauline believers and the Jewish community. Asch

is even more at fault here. This leads to an exaggeration of the originality of Paul. The following quotation from W. L. Knox's book, *Paul And The Churches Of The Gentiles*, indicates the truth that is missed.

"There was indeed a revolutionary element in the teaching which substituted Jesus for the Torah as the centre of the Christian life, but this was not specifically Pauline; even those Christians who observed the Torah with the utmost strictness recognized that Jesus has superseded the Torah as the centre of the whole of the Christian life."²

In Book VI Klausner narrates the career of Paul, following the outline of Acts. We can illustrate the differences between the two authors by choosing two aspects of the so-called second journey. Sholem Asch follows the Acts account in telling how Paul willingly accepted the decrees of the Council of Acts 15 and took them back to the churches. Klausner holds that the decrees were accepted by all at the Council, but that Paul refused to mention or obey them in his subsequent work. Again, Asch accepts the Acts account of how Paul refrained from work in Asia or Bithynia as he came down to Troas. But Klausner writes: "Of course, the true reason was that information reached Paul that his opponents among the Jews or Gentiles of Asia and Bithynia were very numerous and powerful."

Both Wrede and Klausner accept the view that Paul was an epileptic. Asch implies it but never uses the term. One of the most interesting parts of Klausner's treatment is the section which illuminates Paul's thorn in the flesh and his visions by the parallel testimony from Dostoevsky, an epileptic. But Klausner uses the evidence to enforce his emphasis on the morbidity of Paul. Wrede's treatment of this side of Paul is well known. He accepts the view that Paul was an epileptic. But he concluded his discussion of the matter with the words, "But exaggeration is evil. The preponderant impression which Paul makes is that

of health. There is nothing exalté, nothing that betrays the unrest of a sick soul."³ But we must insist where we have epileptics or psychotics to deal with who were also geniuses, that they be judged by their works and their words. The psychological accompaniments are of interest but do not affect the final significance. This holds for men as various as the Hebrew prophets, Paul, George Fox or William Cowper.

The interpretation of the conversion of Paul is always a crux. It would seem as though a historian in the best sense would be expected to include the moral phenomena as well as the psychological in his data. It is at this point that Beyschlag in his *New Testament Theology* makes an unanswerable reproach to the accounts of Johannes Weiss and Pfleiderer, and one that tells against both Klausner and Asch. For the more superficial view Paul was at the time of his conversion in process of changing his mind with regard to his conception of the Messiah, as a result of his contact with the early followers. It was a case of reorientation of ideas. For Beyschlag, however, "mountains of offense," a moral revolution, lay between Paul and salvation. The conversion came as the result of a moral crisis, such as the one described in the seventh chapter of Romans. "Everyone does not enter into judgment with himself with such pitiless severity as Paul."⁴ And Paul's wrestling was with the law, not just with the ceremonial law as Prof. Riddle has it in his *Paul, Man of Conflict*, but with the law, "thou shalt not covet." Klausner, however, places the emphasis on the attack of epilepsy and the accompanying ecstatic illumination, though he recognizes that Paul is reflecting upon the teachings of the Nazarenes and is haunted by the memories of those he had persecuted.

Klausner returns to the circumstances of Paul's conversion in one of the later chapters dealing with his teaching. Here there is a discussion of the seventh chapter of Romans, and here the writer recognizes

the struggle in Paul's life that preceded his Damascus experience. But instead of recognizing that the struggle was a profoundly moral one,⁵ Paul, we are told, was waging "a hard battle to keep all the ceremonial laws, but did not succeed." Klausner then goes on to contrast Paul's scrupulosity with the immense spirit of toleration or accommodation of the Torah. "The Torah was not given to the ministering angels," he quotes, as well as the so-called Golden Rule of the Halakhah: "We should not impose a restriction upon the community unless the majority of the community will be able to stand it." "For there is no religion like Judaism," adds Klausner, "in allowing for human weakness and imperfection, and there is no book like the Talmud in modifying its strongest demands for observance of the ritual requirement." This line of argument is not reassuring. This spirit of accommodation may pass over from the ritual to the moral requirement. We cannot but recall Weinell's aphorism that it was upon the rock of Paul's honesty that the Law broke itself.

The character and motives of Paul are presented in quite different ways in the two books. The aspects of Klausner's work that will be least pleasing to Christians will be those that construe Paul's motives of action in a depreciatory way. Paul was a "thorough-going opportunist." Much is made of his principle of being "all things to all men," and of his being ready to pose as a good Jew in time of trouble, and circumcising Timothy when it was advantageous to do so. A contrast is drawn between the "successful" adaptations and concessions of Paul as over against the unsuccessful and costly intransigence of Jesus and the prophets. The author agrees that Paul's role of builder and organizer necessitated such complacencies and diplomacy, but the total picture is markedly depreciatory. The Christian scholar would not have difficulty in correcting the picture here. Klausner forgets that on the one hand Jesus recog-

nized areas that were matters of indifference and could avoid making an issue of matters that would preclude his greater witness, and on the other that Paul was uncompromising enough on what counted to earn himself stripes, rods, peril and death. On this whole matter of the character of Paul it is interesting to recall the pages of Wrede, the Christian scholar who has perhaps faced most frankly the weaknesses of the hero. Both Wrede and Klausner deal with the seeming impulse to "glorying"—"I labored more abundantly than they all"—and the tendency to cover a personal assertiveness with the cloak of his vocation. But Wrede closes all such probings with a caution against exaggeration. Klausner falls short here. There is, indeed, acquiescence in certain virtues of Paul, an emphatic tribute to I Corinthians, and a recognition at the end of the book that Paul's ultimate influence made possible a world endowed with the Scriptures of the Jew. But there is no such generous homage to the lover of men, the servant of God, the genius with the towering conception that gave us Romans 8 and I Corinthians 15, as we should expect even of a detached historian. Many illustrations on the other hand, could be given of the wholly admirable candor and generosity of Asch in his appreciation of Paul the man and Paul the hero.⁶ The spirit even of his reservations is seen in the following citation. "His highest spiritual achievements were flecked with complaint and betrayed the bitterness which had not wholly been cleansed from his heart. But these were nothing but flecks. He was aware of them and regretted them passionately."⁷

In *The Imitation of Christ* there is a section on how the Christian should bear himself in the face of misrepresentation and "the vain judgments of men," and the case of Paul is instanced. What is said there is to the point here, for Paul has always been one to give offense, not only to Jews but also to Christians, not only in the course of his career but ever since. Even

those passages in his letters where Paul is forced to set forth his own apologia are turned against him by his critics. The passage reads as follows:

My son, fix thy heart steadfastly in God, and fear not the judgment of man where thine own conscience witnesseth thee to be innocent and clear . . . To please all men is not possible, for though St. Paul labored all that he might, to have pleased all people in God, and did to all men all that he could for their salvation, yet nevertheless he could not hinder it but that he was sometimes judged of others, and despised of them. Wherefore he committed all to God who knoweth all things, and armed himself with patience and meekness against all things that might be untruly spoken against him. Nevertheless, sometimes he answered again, lest by his silence hurt or hindrance might have grown to others.

III, xxxvi

We pause to make one remark here with regard to the depreciation under which Paul labors today among certain Christian theologians and ministers. It is the many-sidedness, the completeness of Paul's Christianity which is the stumbling block. It is human nature to wish to conform others to our own limitations; if we have gifts and insights corresponding to one segment of the full circle of Christian experience we have a blind spot for the other segments. Note that in Paul we find all the types and emphases of New Testament religion; ethical, mystical, apocalyptic, philosophical, administrative, ecstatic. He speaks with tongues more than they all! After he was gone, various schools borrowed of him, this one, one legacy, another, another. But he had encompassed them all. Professor E. F. Scott has brought this out clearly in a notable chapter on Paul in his new volume, *The Varieties of New Testament Religion*.⁸

We can only touch on one further matter suggested by Klausner's treatment of the teaching of Paul. The author strangely makes the familiar and recurrent error of identifying the term "flesh" in Paul with the body, in those numerous and important uses of the term where something quite different is meant. He is thus led not only to

a gross exaggeration of Paul's asceticism, but to a misunderstanding of the profound moral and metaphysical dualism in the apostle's thinking. The misunderstanding here is related to that with regard to the conversion. Indeed it is fundamental. The antinomy of "flesh" and "Spirit" for Paul was not that of body and soul, but of the old Adam and the new, and his struggle was not primarily a struggle with bodily appetite, but with all the temptations of the lower nature. Klausner therefore fails to recognize the dimensions of Paul's moral experience, and his costly and scrupulous exploration of an area left ambiguous and unsettled under the Law.

The volume presents itself to us as a work of objective scholarship. In a footnote the author argues that the consistency of his view of Jesus over the years since his first writing testifies to the fact that his conclusions were reached without those disturbing influences from the changes in the theological climate which, as he sees it, have disqualified the work of the form critics. But Klausner himself presents us with a very interesting test-case. We are usually given to understand that scientific historical method is so objective and so impersonal that like a laboratory experiment it reaches the truth apart from any personal equation of the scholar. In Klausner's work we have found evidence of defective moral evaluations. Is there anything to show that these have affected his strictly historical judgments and findings? We believe that this can be demonstrated, and that we have therefore a far-reaching observation to make with regard to historiography. An historian handicapped by personal limitations in the area of moral evaluations is thereby disqualified from first rate achievement. No field of historical research is so self-sufficient that veracious results can be obtained irrespective of the general scale of values and the world-view of the scholar involved. Conversely, of course, faulty study of historical evidence can result in seriously

erroneous judgments on important matters of value. In the study of Christian origins **with** which we have been concerned the historical errors we have indicated arise not only out of inadequate methodology. Some do. Here we have pointed to the lack of grasp of the true character of the book of Acts and its sources, as well as to the superficial interpretation of the term *sarks* in Paul. But historical errors arise also from the personal equation of the author. The deficiency of insight into the motivation of Paul leads him into serious historical error, particularly as regards the reconstruction of Paul's conversion. But a larger error grows out of this initial one, namely in his reading of the causes for the success of Paul. As he sees it, the Gentiles came to the faith because Paul offered them an easy access to the benefits of Judaism, and because he shrewdly presented Judaism in the form of a salvation cult to the Hellenist masses yearning for redemption and immortality. The truth is, however, that the Gospel prevailed because the Word of the Cross, a scandal to the Jew and foolishness to the Greek, *reached down to a new level in the human conscience and crystallized a new order of human relationships*. The Christian movement was a new emergent in history, and its immediate antecedents and constituents, whether in Judaism or in Hellenism, were insignificant in comparison with that which was novel—the new creation.

It remains true that the legacy of Israel was carried over into Christianity. But the question is—what legacy? Certainly not the priestly theocracy of the Second Temple or the current Judaism of the synagogue. Rather, it was the prophetic tradition which indeed had its part in these. Yet, even this legacy was taken over only as it was dissolved by the Gospel and then taken up into a new creation. Klausner, with his consistently high valuation of the political and legal aspects of Judaism, is in a strange dilemma. He denies the essentially Jewish character of Paul's Gospel, and yet he

boasts of the influence of Judaism through the Gospel upon the modern world! He cannot have it both ways. If he defines Judaism in terms of the rabbinic particularism of the time of Christ as he does, then certainly the message of Paul was non-Jewish. In that case he cannot boast of the influence of "Judaism" upon the Christian world. Klausner describes the Palestinian Jews approvingly as those for whom Torah and ceremonial laws were their inmost soul, their life, and their very existence as a separate nation and as a religion.⁹ But the fact is that the Gospel of Paul carried with it in a transmuted form *the legacy rather of the prophets and psalmists*, and thereby Judaism may indeed proudly claim its influence on the Gentile world through Christianity. So we understand Sholem Asch to judge the matter. Indeed, may we not say that the prophets of Israel's own canon are the unrecognized evangelists over against the Judaism espoused by Klausner, and the disbarred advocates in the issue between Jew and Christian and the great controversy between the Lord and his People?¹⁰

This leads to one further question. Klausner charges that Paul made the Jewish heritage "easy" for the Gentile world. Paul thus threatened the existence of the nation for whom the Torah and the ceremonial laws were "their inmost soul." May we ask whether this means, as it seems to, that Gentiles were never to enter into the oracles and heritage of Israel except at the price of assuming the ceremonial law? Did it lie in the purpose of God to Judaize all the tribes and kindreds of the world, and to impose upon the Gentiles of that day, and later upon Gaul, Teuton and Anglo-Saxon, indeed upon Hindu and Buddhist and Moslem, those survivals from primitivism that still characterize the folkways of Israel? If not, if rather the Jew looks to the universal ethics and the religious principles of the prophets and psalmists and wise men, *why demur at the break-*

ing down of the hedge of the Law by Paul? Did God establish the world and convey his initial covenants to men with a primary concern for the survival of any one nation? Is religious leading to be dropped when it leads beyond that nation and its ancient mores? In the institutions of the Second Temple had God said all? Was the talent always to remain in the napkin of the People and the Torah?

FOOT NOTES

¹ *From Jesus to Paul*. By Joseph Klausner. Translated by William F. Stinespring. New York: Macmillan, 1943. *The Apostle*. By Sholem Asch. Translated by Maurice Samuel. New York: Putnam, 1943.

² Cambridge, 1939, p. 96.

³ W. Wrede, *Paul*. Boston, 1908, pp. 22-24.

⁴ W. Beyschlag, *New Testament Theology*. Edinburgh, 1895, II, 53.

⁵ The nearest Klausner comes to suspecting the moral nature of the conversion is presented as it were in a kind of travesty of the matter. "It is actually possible that the fear of sin felt by the Pharisee (i. e., Paul) out of fear brought

about the radical change. . . ." (P. 500).

⁶ "As long as the rumors and accusations concerned only his own person, he strengthened himself and permitted himself no overt act or word against the men of Jerusalem, that he might not split the congregation which had been founded by the Lord . . . Paul swallowed down his bitterness, and the taste of it was like poison." (P. 492)

⁷ P. 666.

⁸ New York, 1943, ch. IV.

⁹ P. 507.

¹⁰ No one interested in the basic issues of these two books, especially as they bear on Jewish-Christian relations today, should overlook the strikingly bold treatment of them in F. C. Grant's new volume, *The Earliest Gospel*, chapter X. "Was Mark Anti-Semitic?" "I am sure," he says, "that, taken at their best, Judaism and Christianity are not two religions, but one" (p. 225). Dr. Grant laments that the Jews did not accept Jesus, "not as the Messiah, which many present-day scholars think he never claimed to be; not as the Son of Man . . . but as 'the teacher of the way of God in truth.'" And he goes on to visualize what might have happened to Israel in the first century if Jesus had been accepted by his people in some such terms.

A Religious Attitude Inventory

IRWIN R. BEILER

A COLLEGE TEACHERS OF religion or the Bible we could not escape, if we so wished, the academic objectives of our work. Whatever other incidental or secondary, perhaps even major purposes we may have, this aim will include a knowledge of the field with which we deal, knowledge of the Bible, its history, and its content, knowledge of the origin, history and nature of religion. Recent studies¹ indicate that this emphasis is dominant, quite naturally, among us, perhaps sufficiently that it may on occasion set a front the actual facts hardly warrant. To this factual content emphasis must be added other items in these objectives such as training in the capacity to think and to think more critically. But this is not all.

The teacher is invariably interested in something more than knowledge of a field or training in a skill. He is aware that increased knowledge, however much an aid to other such ends, is not always a means to the possession of favorable and desirable attitudes on the part of the student. Is one who knows more religious than one who does not know? Just as one can know the right and do the wrong so one may know religion without an accompanying religious attitude or concern. Interested as we are in knowledge the most of us are interested in it not as an end but rather more as an instrument, in what it may be used to do, in a spirit it may induce or generate. Quite as important as what this student may know is the kind of person or citizen this student's knowledge may lead him to become, or the kind of attitude he may have toward his fellows and their varied relations to him. To most of us what one knows is less im-

portant than how that knowledge may move him to act. Is there a way of discovering how the student feels about things, what his attitudes toward his fellows and social issues about him may be?

Other problems of the teacher of religion lead down the same path. If the required course in Bible or religion runs but three hours in one semester, and at least one-half of it is gone before we really begin to know the student, the loss in terms of what can be done for him may be considerable. Is there any way we can come to know more about the student before we begin? How may we get more accurate information about his religious needs, and these constitute the difference between where he is and where he should be, not only in what he knows but as well in his attitudes toward various life situations. Important here will be an information test, adjusted as well as possible to the level of entering students, and such a test should be used. For the latter area, that of attitudes, the information test may be helpful but will not suffice. Is it possible to discover the student's needs in the plane of his feelings and attitudes toward life situations around him?

Further, what is the effect of religious teaching or of the college experience altogether on the student? A partial answer to this query is given by the series of information tests the average student confronts in a college course. What has he learned? What progress in knowledge has he made since his entrance into college or since the first or second year of that experience? No less important is it to find out, if possible, the result of the college impact on the student in other ways. He may have learned much and have become more illiberal and intolerant. Is he more or less conservative, democratic, or socially-minded? Can this

¹"Objectives of Teachers of Religion," by Carl E. Purinton in *Journal of Bible and Religion*, August, 1942.

be brought to light? Could an inventory, taken as he entered college with the purpose of revealing some of his needs at that time be so constructed that taking it again near the close of a college course might show the degree of progress, or regress, made in his attitudes toward other humans or life situations about him?

The writer is one of those who believe there is a possible answer to these questions, a way of discovering not only what a student knows but quite as well what his attitudes toward his environment and its social issues may be. What attitudes should he have? The answer to that may not always be clear but certainly some attitudes are better than others. That behavior is better, we would likely agree, which makes for the greatest good of the largest number—even if that is a bit vague. After some study of this problem six basic attitudes were chosen: democratic, critical, liberal, tolerant, humanistic, and cooperative, and these were used as categories under which to collect statements formulated to arouse these attitudes. These terms were first defined in an effort to make their content more precise. Critical was defined as "a tendency to distinguish between appearance and reality, to judge with care and precision, and a willingness to question authority and the *status quo* if the evidence supports." Tolerant was defined as "a tendency to respect the different physical, cultural, intellectual, religious, or personal peculiarities of other races, nations, groups, and individuals, and to concede them essentially equal opportunity." And so with the other four.

Then items were formulated, studied, tried out on people, and put through a sifting process until 192 such statements had been collected, 28 of which were listed as democratic, 54 as critical, 63 as liberal, 24 as cooperative, 41 as tolerant, and 34 as humanistic. This means that these statements in each case were so formulated that they were believed to provoke, either pro or con, the critical, tolerant, or what-have-

you attitude. Since these numbers add to a sum slightly greater than 192, it is clear that they are intended in some cases to measure more than one trait. Typical statements follow. Democratic: "Social prestige should be one of the important objectives of a college education." "Negro and Chinese workers should have equal rights with white workers in labor unions." Critical: "Any religion is true if a follower of it sincerely thinks it is." "Safety first is always a good slogan for a Christian." Liberal: "God's truth is that the earth moves rather than the sun as the book of Joshua states." "Christian love is likely to favor collective bargaining." Tolerant: "I would give my dishes an extra rub after entertaining Negroes." "Relief funds should not be paid to communists." 192 such statements were given to 133 college students, all freshmen but eleven. With reference to each statement they were asked to underline A, U, or D to express agreement, uncertainty, or disagreement.

The results of this use of the Inventory were studied. Some statements were discovered to be almost useless in measuring traits so as to distinguish between students since the attitude toward them was well nigh unanimous. That result was fully expected but there were some surprises. The reaction of 100 students to "The first consideration in choosing a vocation should be the amount of money that can be made from it" was A 5, U 6, and D 89. The same group divided on "It is proper for white men to be paid higher wages than Negroes are paid for the same kind of work" to the tune of A 6, U 11, and D 82. The same 100 voted on "Freedom of speech should be denied to people like the communists" A 11, U 15, and D 74. There were others no less striking. Item analyses made it clear that a number of the statements should be eliminated, and some others might be saved by restating or in some other way clarifying them.

Of the 133 students who took this in-

ventory as freshmen in Sept. '41, 62 repeated it a year and a half later as sophomores (Feb. '43). A tabulation of their mean scores at each time indicated significant gains in three categories.

	Fresh.	Soph.	Diff.
Democratic	17.82	18.63	.81
Critical	29.66	32.48	2.82
Liberal	30.68	35.06	4.38
Tolerant	25.26	25.58	.32
Humanistic	24.02	23.07	-.05
Social Sensitivity	33.56	34.23	.67
Religiously Liberal	25.06	30.45	5.39

The group seems to have made significant gains in critical and liberal attitudes, and in religious liberalism. Since the last-named trait is scored not on a separate list of statements but as a composite on items drawn chiefly from the critical and liberal categories, it would look, on the surface, as if the only gains were in the critical and liberal areas. Closer analysis shows the real situation to be neither so simple nor so discouraging, either for the students or the Inventory as that would show it to be.

Striking an average works no more magic on the actual facts concerning these 62 students than would classifying a great variety of bovines as cattle upon the differences within that variety. A division of the group into two parts, the upper 31, generally superior in either mental capacity or social sensitivity, and the lower fifteen for whom college seems to have meant a loss of ground, in general, discloses the fact that there is no such dead level as the above table of mean scores would suggest. The mean scores of the "better" and of the "poorer" sections of the group follow:

	"Better"		
	Fresh.	Soph.	Gain
Democratic	17.30	19.90	2.60
Critical	26.	35.84	9.84
Liberal	29.68	39.45	9.77
Tolerant	25.26	29.23	3.97
Humanistic	23.55	25.68	2.13

Social Sensit....	33.42	38.23	4.81
Relig. Liberal ...	23.55	34.35	10.80
"Poorer"			

	Fresh.	Soph.	Gain
Democratic	17.27	15.67	-1.60
Critical	29.6	25.2	-4.4
Liberal	30.6	27.33	-3.27
Tolerant	23.13	18.67	-4.46
Humanistic	24.	21.	-3.
Social Sensit....	31.67	26.73	-4.94
Relig. Liberal....	25.07	23.87	-1.20

For the more intelligent and sensitive part of the group there was a gain in all the categories, and sufficient to convert an average loss in the humanistic area into a gain, if not a very significant one.

The "poorer" fourth is the group that presumably most needs the help the college is able to give. Its members seem to be less critical-minded, less tolerant and socially sensitive as sophomores than they were as freshmen. Again a closer analysis shows the situation to be much better than appears on the surface. But four of the number have actually lost ground. What about the other eleven?

	A	U	D
Freshman	15.67	4.35	6.77
Sophomore	13.30	9.32	4.45
Difference	-2.37	3.97	-2.32

The scores of these eleven have gone into the "uncertain" column. To somewhat individualize this table of the eleven, a U4 for a freshman became U 30 for the sophomore, a U 10 in one case became 25 later, and again and again the number doubled. As sophomores they had discovered they did not have the answers to these issues. Some of their freshman certainties later became uncertainties. In this condition there is a degree of danger but is it not what ought to be going on if a truly educational function is being served? The danger is that of the educational process. And it is at least possible that a better educational process is under way with this "lower" part of the group than

with those whose scores are more positive and seemingly favorable. The losses, so apparently recorded on this group, are almost wholly to be construed in terms of uncertainties. They stand to losses as 3 to 1. The slight loss in religious liberalism indicates that the chief area for both losses and uncertainties has been in that of critical issues, tolerance, and sensitivity to social questions, that area where popular attitudes and general social prejudices are most influential.

Further, Dr. H. S. Dyer, now of Harvard, a colleague of a year or two ago, made a study to find out the reliability with which these six fundamental traits were being measured, and to learn the extent to which these traits were related to each other. He naturally observed that a reliable measurement of six traits by a test of 192 items was a good deal to expect, and his study made by means of the Kuder-Richardson Formula, showed the cooperative, democratic, and humanistic traits in the Inventory to be low in reliability, and rising from the lowest in that order. His study of the correlations among the several traits led to a questioning of the same group. In the light of this study of the item analyses made on this use of the Inventory, and of studies made of many of the statements, a revision of the Inventory was started in the summer of '42. The democratic, which was not clearly testing much outside other categories, and the cooperative categories were eliminated. Due to this and to the item analyses about thirty statements were rejected, and additions were made so that the present Inventory has 196 statements divided between four categories. In addition there are the two composite groups drawn from the preserves of the four. It may be noted that an effort was made to expand both the quality and the quantity of the humanistic statements.

This revision of the Inventory is naturally believed to be an improvement on the original. That is borne out by the reactions

of a number of individuals to them as well as by the 115 students who have taken it. Partial item analyses indicate that the number of statements to which the response was formerly nearly unanimous has been much reduced. While we have these evidences of an improved instrument, the ascertaining of its real value awaits its use by a much larger number of students, and then on the basis of those results the making of further item analyses, and studies to ascertain their reliability or validity in measuring the traits selected. Its value is not yet assured but enough has been learned from its use thus far that the writer is convinced it is moving in the right direction.

Many have contributed to the formulation of the statements used in the Inventory, and a colleague suggests that the process by which the judgments as to what constitutes favorable or unfavorable responses to these statements should be stated. Obviously this was necessary to effect any scoring of these responses. Care was taken to make sure that these were not the judgments of any one or even any two or three persons. They ran the gamut of the criticism of no less than a dozen well qualified people, a member of the staff of the Cooperative Study in General Education, at least three other college teachers in my own field, at least three college teachers of Foreign Language and English, and no less than four upper class college students of ability.

There are those who concede the goal of this effort to be highly desirable but hold it is doomed to be futile. It is an effort, they think, to measure the immeasurable. One of the most distinguished among its critics believe there is too much disagreement as to what religion is to make possible any measurement of religious attitudes, even if we could agree what these are. But why does the latter agreement need to wait upon the former as to the meaning of religion as a concept? Whether the dominant religious interests are mystical or naturalistic, idealistic or positivistic, Barthian or neo-Thom-

ist, or something else, what constitutes the religiously critical mind, a tolerant spirit, or a socially sensitive attitude will have enough agreement threading it to warrant quite general use. The question naturally arises, too, as to what the difference is between a critical, a tolerant, a socially sensitive attitude in general, and those described as religious. Without attempting to argue it the position here is that there is little difference save that the latter attitudes are more religiously motivated and oriented.

The same distinguished critic questioned whether any item or statement in the Inventory could really tell us anything about the religion of a reactor, and so even of a religious attitude he might have. That criticism the writer concedes so far as individual items are concerned. To know how I feel about collective bargaining or the cause of slums may singly tell precisely nothing about my religious life or attitudes. It follows that my reacting favorably on one or two items more or less than another may have no significance whatever. It is in

trends, the degree to which one is above or below the median his group sets, that the significant here is found. Consequently, though single items, or even a few of them, one way or the other from the group median may tell little, the trend in my reactions to 45 items each in the tolerant and humanistic columns, to 71 items in the liberal, or to 76 items in the critical category, if they are distinctly above or below the group median, ought to tell something very valuable about me. And valuable as is the information set in learning something of importance about me—there is here no substitute for it—this religious attitude inventory will disclose a picture the former test may never show. If the information it furnishes us about students can be shown to be reasonably reliable there will be many teachers of religion of high academic standards who will regard it as no less important than that given by our information tests. This promises to be an important supplement to our information testing program.

Eleven Years of the *Journal*

LOUISE S. EBY

EARLY in the year 1933, a slim little magazine of thirty-six pages came to the members of the N. A. B. I. It bore the title, *Journal of the National Association of Biblical Instructors*. On the editorial page Professor Ismar J. Peritz, the editor at that time, explained that preparation for the appearance of the new magazine had been made during the immediately preceding years while the publications of the Association were still appearing in *Christian Education*. From 1933 to 1937 the *Journal* was issued semi-annually. The first issue, as has just been mentioned, was thirty-six pages in length, but the next number had increased to forty, and by the end of the next year, it had assumed the bulk that was subsequently to prove its average length, sixty to sixty-five pages.

The content of these early volumes was rigidly Biblical—a statement which held true until 1937. The quality of the papers and articles appearing in the *Journal*, many of which are papers read before the annual meetings of N. A. B. I., has remained constant not only through these early years, but throughout the entire eleven years of its existence; for the publication represents the Association, whose personnel, except for the accidents of time and chance, has remained substantially the same for the whole period. From the first a goodly proportion of space was devoted to reviews of books in the field. The original issue gave about ten per cent of its pages to this purpose, but this amount increased until by the end of 1935 it had reached its present proportion of twenty per cent. In the beginning the book reviews were so brief that there was little room for comment. Consequently, the reviews tended either to do no more than

to describe the contents of the books, or commented positively or negatively without being able to give a balanced and considered impression of them. At first, also, Professor Peritz wrote a goodly number of the reviews himself, but as the magazine enlarged, he was able to distribute them widely among the membership of the Association so that the majority of it is now represented in this section of the publication.

The year 1937 was a momentous one in the history of the *Journal*. In that year for the first time it broadened its scope and changed its name to the *Journal of Bible and Religion*. Furthermore, it appeared quarterly instead of semi-annually. The end of that year saw a change of a different sort; for upon the resignation of Professor Peritz, because of his advanced age, the present editor, Professor Carl E. Purinton, succeeded him. No startling changes in policy were initiated by the latter, but some alterations in form appeared in the issue for the winter quarter of 1938, the first under his direction. He instituted the practice of devoting a whole page to notes on the contributors, and divided the books reviewed into two classes, the more important ones which were given full reviews and the less significant ones which were the subject of briefer comment in a section entitled "Book Notices." He also appended a list of books received at the end of the latter section. These changes in forms, with some minor additions, have become permanent and familiar features of the *Journal* down to the present time.

A few general characteristics of the *Journal* seem to the writer to run through both the earlier and later periods of its history. While its scope previous to 1937

was narrower and was concerned almost exclusively with the methods and content of Bible teaching, the period from 1937 to the present was marked by a great broadening so that it came to cover the interests of the whole field of the teaching of religion. The type of scholarship represented in the *Journal* has remained the same throughout. Perhaps the quality of this scholarship can best be appreciated by comparing it with that of the *Journal of Biblical Literature*. Instead of the detailed, recondite and highly specialized scholarship characteristic of the latter periodical, the *Journal of Bible and Religion* in so far as it is concerned with content, deals with wholes as opposed to isolated parts and minute details. It devotes its space to method in teaching all branches of the field, to original ideas and experiments, to sharing unique and interesting experiences of N. A. B. I. members that enrich the teaching of all of us, and to throwing light upon the moot questions and vexing problems of the moment in various branches of our subject. Occasionally it even opens its pages to exceptional papers written by students of N. A. B. I. members. From time to time, also, articles on special topics outside of the field but related to it are interpreted for us in the *Journal* by experts in these branches.

In general the editors of the *Journal* have made an excellent selection of papers to be printed. These cover, at some time or other, almost every conceivable interest of the teacher of the Bible and religion. In the main the originality and scholarship of the published papers is very high, though now and then the wholes that the writers see are the wholes we all see and have long seen. But this is of rare occurrence. Certain long-standing debates recur periodically within the pages of our *Journal*, without advancing thought on the subject very far. One of these which forced itself upon the attention of the writer is our discussions of objectives in teaching religion. Whenever this subject is discussed, opinion al-

ways divides into two groups: those who believe that the main purpose of the teacher of religion is to propagate the faith by more or less evangelistic means, and those who believe that the teaching of our subject should be on the same scientific basis as other studies in the curriculum, but presented in such a manner as to allow the religious values to make their own appeal. These divisions of opinion, supporting their cases respectively with the same groups of arguments, may be seen in all our discussions of the subject, whether it be the study of objectives reported in the *Journal* (X. '42, 3), or in any of the articles on the topic that appear year by year and have appeared at frequent intervals ever since the very first issue of the *Journal*.

Another of our perennially inconclusive debates is on the question of whether a major in religion or one in some cultural or scientific subject during the college course affords better preparation for graduate study of theology. During the year 1943 this matter was debated pro and con in the *Journal* by Professor Filson and Professor J. Paul Williams. The former maintained that a major in some other field was more desirable for the future theologian (Jl. XI. '43, 1), while the latter defended a college major in religion (Jl. XI. '43, 2). The arguments each advanced for his opinion bore an uncanny resemblance to those put forward on this same question in an article by Professor Charles D. Matthews, in which he summarized a debate on the problem which had appeared in *Christian Education* for 1931, (Jl. IV. '36, 2). This is another instance of an issue on which there is a permanent division of opinion among us, and on which our thought apparently travels in circles.

Before waxing statistical as to the proportion of the space in our publication devoted to various divisions of the field, the writer wishes to mention certain special and occasional articles that she feels have been stimulating and helpful. Some of these grew

out of unusual privileges and experiences participated in by individual contributors to the *Journal* and shared with us all in its pages. Such an article was Professor Georgia Harkness' "Impressions of Oxford" (Jl. V. '37, 4), in which she gave some of her reflections on the Oecumenical Council held at Oxford that year. Another article of this type was Professor Hazel E. Foster's "India and the Bible," in which she collected certain parallels she observed between Indian religious practices and those of the Bible during her two years' sojourn in that country, (Jl. X. '42, 4). A third was Professor Goodspeed's account of his experiences in heading up the work of translating the whole Bible (Jl. IX. '41, 1), and a fourth, Professor Dahl's "Revising the Revision" (Jl. IX. '41, 2).

A second type of special article is concerned with small points of interest, or obscure figures,—one might almost say little oddities in the field—which catch the attention of members from time to time, and on which they do research. Examples are Professor William J. Scarborough's account of James the Just, (Jl. IX. '41, 4); and Professor S. Vernon McCasland's "Gabriel's Trumpet," (Jl. IX. '41, 3), in which he traces the earliest references to Gabriel as trumpeter for the Last Day, a function which that angelic worthy does not hold in the New Testament, but which has long been firmly fixed in popular tradition.

Some notice is taken within the pages of our *Journal* of important anniversaries, such as Professor John W. Flight's informative article on "The Guide of the Perplexed," an exposition on the philosophy of Moses Maimonides' great work, written in commemoration of the eight hundredth anniversary of the death of that greatest of Jewish philosophers (Jl. III. '35, 1). Our celebration of the anniversary of Coverdale's Great Bible was somewhat belated, for it was not until the first issue for 1937 that an article inspired by that occasion appeared. This was Professor Ralph Harlow's "Shar-

ing the Bible in Strange Tongues," (Jl. V. '37, 1). Further examples of anniversary features are the symposium *Fifty Years of Biblical Study*, to which Professor W. A. Irwin contributed the article on the progress of Old Testament scholarship during that period, Professor Donald Riddle the one on that of New Testament scholarship. Examples might be multiplied, but enough have been given to show that our *Journal of Bible and Religion* does not let the great occasions pass by unmarked.

One permanent feature of the *Journal* from its very first appearance has been the inclusion of faithful and interesting reports of the progress of Biblical archaeology by those of our members who are specialists in this field. (These, of course, are in addition to the reviews of books on archaeology which are regularly reviewed in the book review section). They occupy about two and a half per cent of the total space in the *Journal* and comprise a most informative and important portion of the content side of the *Journal*.

Of course no one who is a regular reader of the publication doubts that it is primarily a teacher's magazine so that none of you will be surprised to hear that fifty per cent of the *Journal's* space is devoted to the teaching side in one way or another. This figure, of course, includes all discussions of general methods and objectives for the whole field, for individual branches of it, and also the accounts of special courses and experiments in the departments of certain members of N. A. B. I. It also comprehends the reports of surveys of the work of departments of Bible and religion, and the research by committees on general educational concerns of the whole field throughout the preparatory schools, colleges and universities of the entire country. Twenty per cent more of the *Journal's* pages are devoted to book reviews and book notices, and the remaining thirty per cent to content. Even the papers that are concerned with content rather than method are usu-

ally, though not invariably, written from the standpoint of classroom presentation rather than of pure research. (The latter type of article generally appears in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*.)

Many of the teaching problems have been the subject of discussion from various angles through symposia, most of which have been held as panel discussions in the meetings of either the eastern or the mid-western branch of our society. The first number of the *Journal* every year contains these together with a report of comment from the floor by members other than those participating in the panel. It will be remembered that the *Journal* started in 1933, at the depth of the depression. Its earliest issues contained symposia and articles on meeting the religious problems of students during that critical time. After the depression came the war, and a number of papers on teaching religion in wartime have appeared in the *Journal*, especially since Pearl Harbor. The issue for February 1943 contained such a symposium on this timely subject.

Besides these general discussions of teaching problems, some papers on the subject of instruction in more specialized branches of the field may be cited. The latest issue (Jl. XI. '43, 4) contained a most original and stimulating article on "Teaching Biographies" by Professor Fred Eastman. In it he described his aims and methods in teaching the course on that subject which he offers at Chicago Theological Seminary. Another example of this sort was Professor Albert Bailey's "Art as a Teaching Instrument" (Jl. IX. '41, 2). A third, that of P. L. Pemberton (Jl. X. '42, 4), advocated the teaching of theology to undergraduates. From time to time there have also been papers on the teaching of church history, of religious education, of philosophy of religion and on the values for religion courses in current or classic literature. An example of the last class is the editorial in the latest issue of the *Journal* on the religious values in Dostoyevsky by Professor Purinton.

The editorials, to conclude the discussion of them, during the regimes both of Professor Peritz and of Professor Purinton, have been timely and have covered a wide range of subjects from form criticism to the name of the *Journal*.

A few additional words must be said upon the subject of the book reviews. During the eleven years of the *Journal's* existence about a thousand books have been reviewed more or less extensively. The reviews vary in length from the "feature reviews", which run from two to five pages, to comments of a few sentences or a paragraph. The "feature review," first introduced by our editor in 1941, is a special and significant way of recognizing the importance of the really great books in the field, such as the two volumes of Reinhold Niebuhr's *The Nature and Destiny of Man* and Robert H. Pfeiffer's *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Recently, also, Professor Edna Baxter has been writing annual reviews of the most notable books on the various phases of religious education. Like the "feature reviews," these are several pages in length.

In general the ordinary reviews vary in length according to the importance of the books. The more significant have, since 1938, been placed in the book review section, where they are conveniently classified under headings of philosophy, theology, Old and New Testament and so forth—a practice our present editor introduced with the number for the last quarter of 1939. The less significant books are reviewed, usually rather briefly, in the book notice section. The books which are placed here are those which have less direct bearing on the field, or are of inferior quality ranging down to the lunatic fringe. In general the writer has agreed with the editor's consignment of books to this latter section, though in a few cases she feels that the ones placed here are as important as many of those in the book review section. One recent exception must suffice. This is J. W.

Whale's *Christian Doctrine* (Jl. XI. '43, 2). Although she is by no means a convert to Whale's theology, his latest book seems to her of sufficient importance to have been included in the book review section. Such exceptions are, at all events, of rare occurrence, and, of course, estimating the value of books is at best a subjective matter.

Of the books given regular reviews, 39 per cent of the reviews were favorable, 10 per cent unfavorable, 38 per cent objective in their comment, while the remaining 13 per cent simply described the contents of the book without passing any judgment on its quality. Although the writer does not suppose that the following observations are of particular significance, she was interested to observe that the most laudatory reviews usually came from books reviewed by outstanding experts in the field, and also that the clerical members of the society were much more charitable in their judgment of the books than the professorial ones.

In conclusion, the writer is taking upon herself to make a few suggestions which her study of the eleven years of the *Journal* has led her to believe might improve it in a few particulars, though in the main she wishes to record her opinion that it has been excellently edited, and that our present editor is improving its form continually. The reviewer was impressed by the fact that a considerable number of the titles were poor, even when the articles they headed were excellent. The titles were, in many instances, two or even three printed lines in length, cumbersome, unwieldy and pedantic, the kind German savants of the Kantian persuasion might originate. It would improve the *Journal* if our editor, in future, forces us to retitle papers he accepts from us for publication, if our own titles are open to these objections.

In the main this survey of the *Journal* has led the writer to the conviction that our publication covers the interests of nearly all members of the Association, except perhaps psychology of religion, which may be taken

care of in other periodicals, such as *Religious Education*. It would seem, however, that the teaching members of the society would derive benefit from the publication of more papers by the non-teaching members. To be sure, some articles by certain of our number who are ministers or academic administrators have from time to time appeared in the *Journal*, but the group is small in proportion to the names on our roster of those in other branches of service who have never written for the *Journal*. For instance, one of our members is the head of the religious department in one of the great American publishing houses. Would it not be useful to us in our teaching to have the benefit of his experience in mediating religion to the laity? Several others are in the Y. W. C. A. or with the boards of one or another of the Protestant denominations. Would they not make a contribution to our thinking on how we can best serve the churches and other religious organizations? Not a few are chaplains whose contacts with the armed forces might furnish valuable lessons for us in our teaching.

Some years ago in an article entitled "The Place of Undergraduate Research in the Teaching of Religion" (Jl. III. '35, 2), Professor David Adams of Mount Holyoke College suggested that the *Journal* might open its columns to more undergraduate papers. I would like to reiterate Professor Adams' suggestion, for in all its eleven years, the *Journal* has published only four such papers, three by undergraduates and one by a Smith alumna who had just been graduated. It may, of course, be that the quality of the papers we correct is not such that we wish to expose them to the editorial staff of the *Journal*, but it may also be that the teaching members of the society and the staff of the *Journal* have not given this matter sufficient consideration. Surely we ought to do all in our power to encourage the students who will be the future recruits to our profession.

These suggestions, however, are put forward hesitantly and tentatively, for the *Journal* has always been a strong publication which has constantly improved through the midst of even depression and war. It has met the challenges presented to our

field by those crises. No doubt in future it will continue to improve and to grapple still more adequately with the challenges to the teaching of religion which the postwar world will offer.

To th
Dr.
2) of
readily
cal vic

"2")
tions
and R
truth,
other

In
canno
repea
to str
that i
refuse
It wa
My
articl
and
passa

"It
to ma
sibilit
illiter
kinds
for h

M
logic
"D

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

A Rejoinder to Doctor Chave

To the Editor:

Dr. Chave's suggestion in his paragraph 2) of his reply to Dr. Filson and myself is readily acceptable to persons of the theological viewpoint. That suggestion is:

"2") be ready to critically examine basic assumptions regarding such matters as revelation, God and Reality, uniqueness of Jesus Christ, Biblical truth, supernaturalism, naturalism, humanism, and other forms of theological expression."

In thus saying that a functional approach cannot succeed without that, Dr. Chave is repeating what theologians have been trying to stress against an exclusive functionalism that ignores such theological questions and refuses examination of its own assumptions. It was the real issue of the symposium.

My impression was that Dr. Chave's main article rejected what his rebuttal suggests, and that theology was referred to in the passage:

"It is not strange that some people have tried to make a *strategic withdrawal shifting the responsibility* upon their deity. It is not strange that *illiterate and uncritical* minds have concocted all kinds of *fantastic dreams* in their *blind outreach* for help." (Italics mine for future reference.)

More specifically does he discard the theological approach in:

"Do we have good precedent and justification

for trying to shift the focus of attention from doctrines and ceremonial practices to the spirit and operation of religion in the commonplaces of life."

Theology seeks nothing so earnestly as "the operation of religion in the commonplaces of life." It accepts everything the functional approach can offer, but insists that functions must be understood in the light of the kind of questions Dr. Chave now proposes. Its opposition is to the exclusivism, or partialization, which ignores and even ridicules the theological mind, and which assumes that anyone with a "theological position" is per se disqualified as a "Biblical scholar using critical historical methods."

That exclusive rejection of theology is a distinguishing mark of most of the writing from the functional viewpoint, and is well illustrated in Dr. Chave's choice of words whenever he refers to theology, e. g.: "*strategic withdrawal*," "*shifting responsibility upon their deity*," "*illiterate*," "*uncritical*," "*blind*," "*fantastic dreams*," "*prejudice*," "*oratory*," "*caricatures*," "*confesses his guilt*," "*admits*."

One finds it difficult to reconcile such an emotional vocabulary with the "objective" view which Dr. Chave champions.

GEORGE M. GIBSON

BOOK REVIEWS

Religion Today and Tomorrow

Protestantism. A Symposium. Edited by WILLIAM K. ANDERSON. Nashville: The Commission on Courses of Study of the Methodist Church. 282 pages. \$2.00.

What and why is Protestantism? Does Protestantism have any principle of unity? Is there sufficient reason for its continued existence? Or is it, as some Roman Catholics argue, "made up of negations without any affirmation or positive truth of its own," "a negative product" of the Catholic church and "its principle of unity . . . reaction against that institution"?¹ With such questions this book deals. Dr. Albert Cornelius Knudson gives one answer to them by listing in the order of his own evaluation five positive principles of Protestantism: 1. The right of private judgment. 2. Justification by faith. 3. The supreme authority of scripture. 4. The sanctity of the common life. 5. The self-verification of faith. None of these five principles originated with Protestantism as Dr. Knudson admits, and yet taken together, these five principles represent an emphasis which suggest a basic difference between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. Dr. Knudson goes even further in the direction of explicitness by indicating that the "basic difference between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism" is that "Catholicism interprets the fundamental principles of Christianity from the standpoint of a major emphasis upon the sanctity of the church, while the Protestant interpretation of them grows out of a major emphasis upon the sacredness of the individual."

Dr. Knudson's chapter on "Cardinal

Principles of Protestantism" seems to the reviewer to be one of the most important chapters of this valuable symposium and to be the hub of the book. It is one of nine chapters in Part II, of the book, which is given the heading, "Interpretations." Ten chapters constitute Part I, labelled "History," while Part III, "Opportunities," includes six chapters.

Part I gives a good exposition of the varied origins and original principles of the different branches of the Protestant Reformation. Abdel Ross Wentz, president of Gettysburg Seminary, writes the chapter on "Luther and His Tradition." George W. Richards, himself a distinguished leader in the Reformed Church in the United States, writes the chapter on "Zwingli and the Reformed Tradition." Georgia Harkness writes on "Calvin and His Tradition," while Joseph Minton Batten writes the chapter on "The Independent Tradition." Material has been gathered together in this last chapter which is not easily available elsewhere and teachers will find this chapter of particular value. Other contributors to this section of the book are John T. McNeill, Martin Rist, E. P. Booth, Alexander C. Zabriskie, W. W. Sweet, and Charles S. Braden.

The "opportunities" of Protestantism, which furnish the subject of Part III, are found "In the Far East" (K. S. Latourette), "In Europe" (H. S. Leiper), "In Latin America" (Gonzalo Baez-Camargo), "In American Education" (E. C. Colwell), in "Our Responsibility for a New World" (Paul B. Kern), and in "A Growing Ecumenicity" (Henry P. Van Dusen). This section of the book strongly supports and illustrates the argument of the first section that Protestantism's continued existence is a matter of vital significance. Dr. Camargo's chapter on Latin America, for example, not

¹A. Brownson and Hilaire Belloc, quoted by A. C. Knudson, p. 134.

only brings out the need of the Protestant emphasis upon the importance of the individual—in relation [for example] to the needs of the millions of ignorant and un-instructed Indians—but also gives a clear picture of the tendency of Roman Catholicism to become an ecclesiastical totalitarianism in a country where it is the religion of the majority and finds no need of any appeal for religious toleration.

The poor quality of paper used in the book is no doubt due in part to wartime restrictions and in part to the attempt to keep the price of the book down.

At any rate, this is a book that teachers of religion will want to have at hand and to put on reference for their students.

CARL E. PURINTON

Beloit College

The Postwar Strategy of Religion. By JOSEPH M. M. GRAY. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 1944. 186 pages. \$1.75.

Postwar plans fly thick and fast. The details of that world that is to be are being limned in from many quarters. It is only right that the representatives of religion should be given their chance to be heard.

Much is to be said for the right of Dr. Joseph M. M. Gray, pastor of the Bexley Methodist Church, Columbus, Ohio, to be one to present the view of the church, for he is fitted to discuss religion where it touches international affairs.

Dr. Gray early sets forth his thesis and devotes his book to the exposition of it. His thesis is: "That religion as operative in the Protestant churches of America, will be genuinely effective in the social reorganization of the world after the war only as its spokesmen recover clear apprehension of the ultimate and imperative objective which religion must pursue, only as they avoid engaging simply in immediate and limited social action, subordinate to the main purpose of religion, however attractive and desirable in itself such action may be." (P. 8).

The difficulty has been, Dr. Gray suggests, that the church's strategy has in the past been at fault, and as a result its tactics have not brought about the desired results. The overall strategy demands a new stressing of the desirability of belief in the great Christian truths for this only can assure the bringing in of "that brave new world" of justice and freedom. It is useless to talk of its coming apart from the moralities without which it cannot survive.

In the words of another, Dr. Gray recommends that if "the church be the church" the validity of its strategy will be assured.

IVAN GEROULD GRIMSHAW

American International College,
Springfield, Mass.

Religion and Education

Church and State in Education. By WILLIAM CLAYTON BOWER. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1944. v 103 pages. \$1.00.

"One of the crucial problems confronting the educational leaders of America is the relation of religion to education in a democracy" (p. 1). This is the problem which Dr. Bower analyzed in the James R. Richard Lectures in Christian Religion at the University of Virginia in November, 1943, and which he has made the subject of this volume. Two chapters are devoted to the history and the contemporary setting of the problem in the United States. Three chapters are devoted to a study of fundamental assumptions and suggestions toward a constructive solution.

Since 1875 we have accepted the general principles of the separation of church and state and the exclusion of sectarian religious teaching from the schools. As the nation has gradually become a vast community we have felt the lack of the values, ideals, and motivation which religion can give. Dr. Bower believes that in this new context of the welfare of the community we can find a solution to the problem.

The solution must be based on a functional interpretation of education and of religion. The author sees no hope if we stay on the institutional plane or think of religion in theological or ecclesiastical terms. "The function of education in a democracy is to assist the young in dealing intelligently and effectively with the issues of contemporary life with the aid of the resources of the funded experience of the past" (p. 45). Religion "is an orientation toward life as a whole. Specifically, it falls within a people's valuational attitudes and occurs when all particular and specialized values are fused into a total meaning and worth of life" (p. 49). Religion integrates all our values and then subjects them all to criticism and revaluation in the light of the ultimate reality. Both education and religion sustain functional relations to the total community and as such are mutually supporting.

Dr. Bower finds six ways in which religion conceived functionally and as a phase of culture may be included in the program of the public school on a non-sectarian basis. (1) Religion should be objectively dealt with wherever it is encountered in the subject matter of the regular curriculum. (2) It can be included as a field of knowledge on a par with literature, natural science, etc. (3) The higher spiritual values can be experienced in the relationships of the school community. (4) Religious attitudes can be cultivated by the use of ceremonials and celebrations. (5) Religion can be explored as a principle for the integration of education and the culture it strives to interpret. (6) The resources of religion can be used in the program of counseling.

Under such a program the church would be charged with the function of religious nurture. (1) The church must make explicit and meaningful the religious values of life; this is the task of modern theology. (2) The church can set life in its universal context and (3) help the individual achieve a sense of at-homeness in the universe. (4) It provides a sustaining fellowship for the

individual and (5) the stimulating environment for the nurture of the religious life. (6) It presents causes which call for loyalty and commitment, and thus secures the integration and expression of the whole self.

Dr. Bower is certainly correct when he indicates that there are difficulties in this solution and suggests that the first attempts to apply it be made in selected small communities under careful supervision. Those who share the "confessional" approach to religion will probably find little comfort in this volume; but if the ecumenical movement in Christendom and the National Conference of Christians and Jews are valid developments they furnish hope for an ultimate solution along the lines suggested.

B. LEROY BURKHART

The College of the Ozarks

The University and the Modern World. By ARNOLD S. NASH, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944, xxii + 312 pages. \$2.50

Has the end of an era come for our colleges and universities? Perhaps the strongest one-sentence indictment ever made of American higher education was the statement of President Hutchins when he said, "It is possible to get an education in an American University." Only those who mirror and are unable to transcend the contradictions of our culture are satisfied with our "system" of higher education.

The thesis of Mr. Nash is that the crisis in which education finds itself is only part of the larger crisis of our whole civilization. With the break-up of the Middle Ages men place their faith in any number of dogmas—in free-trade, in laissez faire, in the essential goodness of man, and the idea that society would somehow automatically progress onward and upward forever. And our universities have reflected this philosophy, which he calls "scientific individualism," which arose from the prestige, and also the

misunderstanding of the nature, of modern science.

The abstraction of fact from value seemed to free the rising physical sciences from the sterile *a priori* rationalism of the Middle Ages. There arose the assumption that what is scientific is "objective;" all else is "subjective" and a mere matter of opinion. Metaphysics and theology, in fact all normative studies, suffered accordingly, and their prestige was lowered in the university curriculum. The unwritten law seemed to be that in order to regain respectability each subject must become "scientific." Some theologians sought their data not in the witness of moral and religious experience, but in the conclusions of the physical sciences. Many philosophers sought refuge in the vagaries of positivism—the attempt to solve most philosophical problems by denying that they exist. Sociology, too, flourished and remained respectable by accumulating facts and by attempting to be merely descriptive instead of normative.

The end result has been the creation of universities with more or less autonomous departments and a chaos of courses. "The liberal democratic university, by rejecting any real attempt to discover and then teach a unified conception of life, refuses to be a university." Mr. Nash analyzes carefully the nature of the Nazi and the Soviet universities which presume to fill the spiritual vacuum created by liberal democratic culture and its universities. He shows why each is unsatisfactory, while avoiding the mistake of assuming they are the same in aim and purpose. Neither race nor class is sufficient as an absolute, for a culture or a university.

A university must stand for something. The real question is not, "Shall we or shall we not have a planned university?" Rather it is, "On what basis shall it be planned, and to what purpose?" Mr. Nash's answer is that Christian scholars should work towards an intellectual synthesis for the

twentieth century which can be set over against the positivistic, the Marxist, the liberal humanitarian *Weltanschauungen* now current. Although rejecting Scholasticism, essential to Mr. Nash's position is the idea that theology should not just be another subject in the university curriculum. It should permeate the curriculum.

This book is a critique of the modern university, and must be judged accordingly. It offers no neat blue-print for the "right" kind of university, but it does suggest directions. The reviewer believes it to be a very important book. Every dean and every president of a church college or university should read it. Many of them may not like parts of it, for it demands that they take their Protestant religion seriously. Nor can the thought of Mr. Nash be fairly judged (and dismissed!) by calling it "Barthian."

A useful bibliography with instructive notes is given. The reader will search for an index which, unfortunately, is not there.

OLIVER MARTIN

Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.

The Old Testament

The Problem of Ezekiel. By WILLIAM A. IRWIN. Chicago University Press, 1943. 344 pages. \$3.00.

Professor Irwin has written an important book on the major critical problem of the Old Testament to-day. The importance of his work may easily elude one, however, unless it is read with attention to detail, constant reference to the masoretic text, and an eye focussed steadily upon the relevant problem. If one is inclined to be disconcerted by what may seem to be extreme conclusions, then he should at least confront himself afresh with the actual phenomena which the text presents.

Let it be said at once that this investigation is the work of an acute and well-equipped scholar. Further, few American scholars have shown a more discerning interest in literary form than Professor Irwin.

The present study in higher criticism shows skill, ingenuity, and not infrequently penetration. Recent years have produced a large number of valuable monographs and commentaries on Ezekiel (e.g. those of Hernt-rich, Hölscher, Herrmann, G. A. Coke, Matthews, and Torrey), and Irwin's work, differing as it does from the others in method and form, should nevertheless be studied with some of the other discussions constantly in mind (esp. Hölscher and Torrey).

After a somewhat disarming introduction, we are given an admirable survey of the history of Ezekiel research. The best part of this chapter is the discussion of the work of Zunz, Seinecke, *et al.* Hölscher, Torrey, James Smith, and Irwin obviously have respectable forbears. One might wish that here or elsewhere more might have been made of the rabbinic "problem of Ezekiel." This is referred to from time to time, to be sure, but it is never fully stated.

This chapter is followed by a series of detailed inductive studies of chapters and sections of Ezekiel in what has proved to Professor Irwin to be the critically most advantageous order. An effort is made to discover authentic utterances. If such units can be found, then we are furnished with criteria for determining the style and manner of the prophet. As this is put, it would seem that the author is involved in circular reasoning, but I think he avoids this fairly well. He deals with the material with great caution. There emerges from his first examination (chap. 15) a clearly-defined and well-constructed oracle. As the studies advance, the criteria stand out with greater clarity, so that the final result is without question very impressive. Whatever judgment one may be finally called upon to make, he cannot but recognize that Irwin has made a strong case. Most of us are naturally suspicious of extreme results; we recall too vividly the Duhms and Cheynes of a former generation and the Hölschers and others whom I shall forbear mentioning of our

own. But, the question is not whether the results are "radical," but whether they follow inevitably from legitimate method and competent handling of the text.

The last section of the book is a statement of conclusions drawn from the foregoing inductive studies. Ezekiel is an historical personality who lived during the first decades of the sixth century B. C. To him are to be attributed some fifty-five passages, many of them composite. With the majority of modern critics, Irwin rejects chaps. 40-48 *in toto*, and of the remaining 1273 verses but 251 are genuine in whole or in part. The vast portion of remaining material is the work of commentators, who developed or interpreted the original words of the prophet. Indeed one of the first clues to an understanding of the book is this elaborate and somewhat complicated commentary, which began shortly after the prophet's death and extended to the beginning of the Christian era. It is the presence of "false commentary" which first opens the door to the main solution. The method of the commentators was often to repeat the prophet's *ipsissima verba* and then to expand them. This often gives us extremely valuable insight into the original text. The work of the commentators gives point to the famous line in *Baba Bathra* that "the men of the great synagogue wrote Ezekiel." One could almost say that this is, in fact, the thesis which Irwin's inductive studies serve to substantiate. The prophet Ezekiel himself lived in Jerusalem where he wrote most of his work, but was later deported to Babylonia. All the dates of the book are fictitious (with the possible exception of 1:1).

Generalizations concerning such a book are perilous because the only fair way to deal with it is to enter into the same detail as characterizes the writer's method. The present reviewer can only say that where he has had time to work through the argument, he has been surprised at the cogency of Irwin's reasoning. He has been disposed to accept some such view of duplicate recen-

sions as that of Kraetschmar, Budde, or Eissfeldt. The diffuseness of Ezekiel's style is extraordinary, and any critical theory must explain it. Irwin's theory does. Moreover, it gives one materials which are crisp and fresh in their prophetic quality. The problem of abnormal psychic personality disappears completely. Ezekiel steps forward into his time quite as clearly as Amos.

And yet, I find myself somewhat harassed by the suspicion here and there that if Professor Irwin had pressed his critical measures just a little further, the whole would vanish into thin air. Further, one wonders whether literary analysis quite as acute as Irwin's but one reckoning with other features of Hebrew literary style, to which Irwin has not been quite so sensitive, might not have produced results which would net us far more material for the historical Ezekiel. One's motives for such suspicions may be questioned, but I think there are features in the text which naturally raise the question. Isn't it possible that the historical Ezekiel has taken on the coloration of Professor Irwin's own mind and taste and temperament? The development of Hebrew literary form in the seventh and sixth centuries B. C. seem to me to suggest a course which runs counter to many of Irwin's units. Again, does Irwin, who elsewhere recognizes so admirably the function of literary device, take them seriously enough here? One misses much of the work of the more competent students of literary form (Gunkel, Gressmann, Mowinkel, Lindblom). More seriously, does the admirable interpretative comment concerning the prophet Ezekiel really grow out of the thought of the Ezekiel Professor Irwin has given us? These are meant to be honest questions, not objections. The book needs to be worked through with a seminar. At any rate, there can be no doubt that research into Ezekiel has been greatly advanced by this new highly instructive study.

JAMES MUILENBURG

*Pacific School of Religion,
Berkeley, California*

Missions

The Great Century in Northern Africa and Asia, A. D. 1800-1914. By KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE, Volume VI of a History of the Expansion of Christianity. New York: Harper Brothers, 1944, 502 Pages. With maps. \$4.00.

Only one volume yet remains to be published of Latourette's monumental History of the Expansion of Christianity, the volume in which his summaries and conclusions will be presented. Volume VI continues the story of the great century, 1800 to 1914, carrying it through North Africa and Asia. It shows the same marks of patient and careful scholarship that have marked the entire series; but if anything, it surpasses the others in interest, because it considers the part of the world, to which Professor Latourette gave many years of personal service, and in the history of which he has already done extensive, scholarly work, particularly in China.

So detailed a study can never make really interesting reading. There is just too much of it. But as a book of reference, within which to find some account of almost everything that has happened during the century in North Africa and Asia, it is quite unequalled by any other publication. Obviously the amount of material given about many of the events of even considerable importance is so little, as to leave one still unsatisfied; for instance, the rise of Brahmo Samaj and its remarkable work in India gets less than a page; the Ramakrishna movement, one of the most dynamic modern movements in Hinduism, rates a half page; the Arya Samaj, but three lines. But here, as is all previous volumes, there is ample documentation of everything that is narrated and a bibliography which leaves little to be desired. One can always follow the various topics in which he is interested back to the sources, if he has them at his command. It is a daring task to try to summarize the entire century's intensive missionary activity in a country like India in

a single long chapter, but just that needs now and again to be done, if many people are to see the picture of the century as a whole.

The addition of a chapter on Asiatic Russia represents something of an innovation, for little has appeared concerning that little known section of the world. All those who have the earlier volumes will, of course, want the complete set. But this volume has a value of its own, quite apart from the remaining volumes, and may be very well purchased alone, if one feels that he cannot afford the whole set. Certainly the three volumes, IV, V and VI, cover as no other publication does, the amazing story of the expansion of Christianity from 1800 to 1914.

CHARLES S. BRADEN

Northwestern University

Religion in History

The Soul of Russia. By HELEN ISWOLSKY. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1943. 200 pages. \$2.75.

Russia is interesting from many points of view, not the least from the religious. Persecuted ever since the beginning of the revolution more systematically and efficiently than perhaps at any other time in history, religion still seems to be one of the most important phases of contemporary Russian life. How can it be explained that although Russia's religion was frequently rated as a more or less decadent form of orthodox Catholicism, nevertheless the better part of a generation of ruthless attempts at suppression have by no means eradicated the profound bent toward religion which has seemed so much a part of Russia for many centuries? Part of the explanation may be found in a book such as the one under review; for it is a brief but very interesting and readable outline of Russia's spiritual history written mainly about the great dynamic personalities, who have influenced religious thought since the conversion of Russia.

It goes far toward an explanation of the

deep-seated, ineradicable spiritual quality of the Russian people. "It is meant," writes the author, "to offer a series of meditations on Russia's great religious themes as they were expressed by her famous writer, thinkers, by her saints and her heroes." Much of it is rather likely to be unfamiliar to Western readers, but it is high time that we of the Western world acquaint ourselves more intimately with the people who seem destined to play an increasingly important role in the march of world events. Whether we like it or not, we shall in the future have to deal much more closely with the Russian people. It will be well if we understand something of the great religious personalities who have influenced their development. Some of those discussed by the author were rulers, some priests, some poets, some novelists—but all men who had great spiritual insight.

Of course, such a brief book can scarcely serve as more than an introduction to a subject so vast, but it certainly is well designed to awaken interest in and point the direction toward a more intensive study of our great sister nation. Written by a Catholic, and I suppose primarily for Catholics, since it is published by a Catholic publisher, it, nevertheless, becomes important reading as well for Protestants.

CHARLES S. BRADEN

Northwestern University

Black Gods of the Metropolis. By ARTHUR HUFF FAUSET. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1944. 126 pages. \$2.00.

The subtitle of the book is much more indicative of its nature than the rather striking title which has been used. It is a study of "negro religious cults in the urban North." It is a serious attempt to present essential facts concerning five negro religious cults in Philadelphia by one, who is himself a negro. Not a few have set themselves to write general books and articles about the cult; this is a specific study in a

local situation, and as such, has considerable value. It is upon the multiplication of studies like this which broad generalizations ought to be made. That unfortunately is not always the case. There is genuine need for many more of the same kind, not only of the cults among negroes but among white groups as well.

The cults considered here are the Mt. Sinai Holy Church of America, the United House of Prayer for all People, the Church of God (Black Jews), the Moorish Science Temple of America, and the Father Divine Peace Mission Movement. Of these the Father Divine movement has been studied most frequently; of the others little has thus far been written. The book is thus a genuine contribution for which students of modern religious movements will be grateful. The study was made largely in person by the writer, who was able to get inside of the groups and observe from within—a very decided advantage. Whether a white person could have done as much, may well be questioned, though some white anthropologists feel that they have won the confidence of groups studied and thus have been able to present a true picture of the cults' beliefs and practices.

In a chapter on the negro and his religion, the author takes exception to the common belief that the negro is somehow more religious than white persons. Actually, he says, the proportion of white men attending churches is higher than that for negroes. Furthermore, he finds that some of the emotionalism, which supposedly goes with the negro, is quite as marked among the white persons who follow Father Divine; while in some of the cults, particularly the Moorish Science cult, there is almost a complete lack of emotionalism.

He presents a summary of findings with which students in the field of religion may not be all agreed; however, they can hardly be overlooked by anyone who attempts hereafter to write concerning negro religion. Altogether the book seems to the writer to

be a distinct contribution to the field of the study of contemporary religion in America.

CHARLES S. BRADEN

Northwestern University

The Loves and Wars of Baal and Anat and Other Poems from Ugarit. Translated from the Ugaritic and Edited with an Introduction by Cyrus H. Gordon. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943. Xvii + 47 pages. \$1.50.

The archaeological discoveries at Ras Shamra in Syria, ancient Ugarit, have been more fruitful for Biblical study than any other similar discoveries in the last few decades (see JBR X, 1942, pp. 67-75). Students who do not read Ugaritic have been handicapped in not having connected translations of the Ras Shamra tablets, and the present volume will help them to overcome that handicap. It contains in English translation those portions of the Ugaritic texts which are at present fairly well understood, and in an order which enables the reader to study them as connected poems. The translation is by no means complete, for there are still many obscurities in the text, and there are still differences of opinion regarding the order in which the fragments should be read.

Dr. Gordon has made many contributions to the elucidation of the Ras Shamra texts, the most notable being his *Ugaritic Grammar*, published in Rome in 1940, of which there are only a few copies available in America. The longest poem here translated is the fertility myth of Baal and Anat, aptly called by Gordon "The Loves and Wars of Baal and Anat." There are selections from "The Birth of Dawn and Dusk," "The Nuptials of Nikkal and the Moon," and the legends of King Keret and Aqhat, son of Daniel.

The Introduction gives a summary of the background of the texts, the Ugaritic language, and the poetic form of the materials, and a few parallels with the Old Testament

(some of them very trivial, it must be admitted).

The author is to be congratulated on the publication of this work, which will prove very useful to Biblical students. A number of details could be criticized, but in a field in which there are many differences of opinion, no one can be dogmatic. The present reviewer regrets that Gordon has used his own symbols for the various texts, rather than those which were used by the original publisher of the tablets, Ch. Virolleaud. Also, the importance of these materials for the study of the Bible is much more profound than the few parallels pointed out in the Introduction suggest.

J. PHILIP HYATT

*School of Religion,
Vanderbilt University*

Biography

The Clue to Pascal. By EMILE CAILLIET.
Philadelphia: The Westminster Press,
1943. 187 pages. \$2.00.

Dr. Cailliet presents the influences which help to explain the remarkable personality of Pascal. The first was his early education by his father whose main principle was "Always hold the child above his task." He also trained him "to observe everything with utmost care and to reason out the course of his observations at every step." He gave him very careful training in the meaning and use of words. At an early age he had a great eagerness to find the truth and a pas-

sion for excellence. These qualities were also the foundation of his scientific mind. Before he was twenty he attained eminence as a mathematician and later made discoveries in the field of atmospheric and fluid pressures.

At the age of twenty-nine Pascal had a life transforming religious experience. He saw a great light flooding his room and sensed a divine message. This illumination was a revelation of the Living Word of God in the Bible. His final written declaration following this experience was "I will not forget Thy Word." This was the chief clue to Pascal. He immersed his life in the study of and meditation on the scriptures and they moulded his thought and action. His love of the Bible made him a living force, and his writings became the immortal literature of the soul. For Pascal, Jesus Christ was the central fact of experience and of faith. To express the supremacy of Jesus Christ was the purpose of the "Pensées."

Dr. Cailliet has written a very scholarly book. It is also a book easy to read and enjoy. No one can read it without catching something of the vigor of mind and spiritual fire of Pascal. Everyone who reads it will be impelled to turn again to the "Pensées" and "Provincial Letters" for fresh guidance of the spirit. It is greatly needed in these days.

WILFRED A. ROWELL

Beloit, Wisconsin